THE RULE OF THE CATHOLICK FAITH:

Sever'd from the Opinions of the Schools, Miſtakes of the Ignorant, and abuſes of the Vulgar.

Written in *French* by *Francis Veron*, Dr. of Divinity, Preacher and Profeſſor Royal of Controverſie, and Paſtor of *Charenton*.

Deputed by the Clergy of France for this Work.

Tranſlated by *E. S.* Eſq;

Phil. 3. 16. *Ut idem Sapiamus; in eadem permanea-mus* REGULA.

PARIS,
Printed by *John Billain*, 1660.

LIBRARY OF THE
UNION
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
NEW YORK

THE TRANSLATOR TO THE READER.

My first perusal of this short Treatise, furnished me both with a Zeal and Resolution of presenting it to my dear Country-men; and chiefly to those, who, justly sollicitous of the important truth of Religion, have taken much pains in sifting variety of Authors, and for want of an exact separation of what is, from what is not absolutely necessary *for a child of the holy Catholick Church to adhere to, have engaged themselves in most intricate and endless difficulties.*

And really, when I consider the heat of our School-men in defence of their Problematical Opinions, and the Arts of our Adversaries, in covering their Errours with the

vail of Scripture, I cannot but tenderly commiserate the condition of such as are out of the way, and contribute the utmost of my endeavours to bring them acquainted with a Guide, that may direct their wandrings, and sustain their weakness, and render their great Journey both short, easie, and secure.

For this Intent, I think it not amiss to acquaint the Reader with some particulars which I have received from Persons of Honour and Credit, concerning the Author not only of this, but of many other Books of Controversie, as well in French as Latin; in both which Languages he sometimes wrote upon the same Questions, as in the very Book I here present you, whereof to make the Translation more plain and useful, I have in some few periods borrowed out of the Latine, what our Author has added there, and was wanting in the French Copy.

He was generally known in France by the name of Pere Veron, much renowned for his Eloquence and variety of Learning, but most admir'd for his great Zeal, and un-

unwearied industry in recovering souls from the giddy disease of Heresie. He was for many years a Father of the Society of Jesus, and as well at the earnest desire of some Reverend Prelates of France, as by the consent of his Superiours, released from that obligation, to employ with more freedome his talent, in reducing those who had sever'd themselves from the Communion of the Church.

He preach'd many years in Paris, with admirable success, and there also taught a Lesson of Controversie, which begat many Disputations and Conferences both with Ministers and other learned persons of the contrary perswasion; in all which he remain'd still more than Conqueror. He was a person truly humble and circumspect in what he undertook, and particularly in framing this Rule of Faith, wherein he resolved not to march alone, but in the company of the most renowned Divines of this later age.

After some years spent at Paris, he was sent into those parts of France, where Calvinism had taken deepest root, as Bearn,

Languedoque, &c. This he perform'd with a vigor proportionable to the greatness of his work, and in all encounters highly prevail'd against his Antagonists, by cleaving close to his Rule of Faith, and not permitting them to obtrude any Proposition upon the Church, which she did not own for Faith; insomuch that the Ministers of those Quarters (after many Conferences and Disputations) entred into a mutual League and Covenant, obliging themselves not to dispute any more with Peter Veron upon any tearms. For, by holding fast to his former Method, he never fail'd to reduce his Adversaries to this exigency, that they must acknowledge the Text of Scripture did not contradict the Doctrine of the Roman Church, though the affirmative is that which they constantly and confidently hold forth, both in their Books and Sermons.

This puts me in mind of what some years since I heard in Oxford, from a person of Honour, and a great Champion of the Protestant Cause, directing his speech to some Divines of that University

L. Falk.

That

That, though he had a particular gust for the ſtudy of Controverſie, yet he never thought his time worſe ſpent, than in frequenting the Sermons of ſuch who pretended moſt to oppoſe the Church of Rome, in regard they ſeldome ſtated the Queſtion ſo right, that the Papiſts were really concern'd in the Doctrine they oppugned, and by that means they ſpent much time, and many words, in confuting an Adverſary of their own framing; an Obſervation which I every day find confirm'd in Proteſtant Writers, and may juſtly far more ſuſpect the ſame proceeding in their Preachers.

The Intention of our Author is to remove all miſtakes in matter of Controverſie, and to bring his Reader home to the Queſtion, freed from all needleſs and impertinent diverſions; to the end he may ſooner attain a clear ſolution of his Doubts, the true and only ſcope of a Controvertiſt. But ſince ſupernatural verities have no entrance into the underſtanding of man, without the powerful aſſiſtance of ſupernatural Grace, it is that

which

which I humbly beg of Almighty God for all my dear Countrey-men, involv'd in the sad confusion of Opinions, that, by resting safe in the judgement and bosom of the holy Catholick Church, they may enjoy a contented mind in this world, and eternal felicity in the next.

E. S.

To the LORDS of the Assembly General of the *Clergy* sitting at *Paris*.

My Lords!

I Present you with, and submit to your Judgments, this Piece, of a choice and singular nature, design'd for the Ground-work of a Temple of Christian Peace; projected by a *David*, a man of war, but by Divine Providence reserv'd for the peaceable *Solomon*, your *Assembly*; whose weapons are not the temporal Sword, but *that of the Spirit, which is the Word of God*: to you, I say, who are the *Pastors and Doctors*, given by God to his Church, *to the consummation of the Saints, to the edifying of the Body of Christ, till we all meet in the Unity of Faith, and knowledge of the Son of God, into a perfect man, that we be no longer Children, wavering and carried about with every wind of Doctrine, by the fallacy of men, by their cunning craftily to seduce.* Card. Richl.

This *David* had passionately desir'd to crown his warlike Actions with these Olive-branches

of Peace; or, in case he had shut up the Temple of *Janus*, his ordinary place of Residence, then to build up this of Peace, and had appointed the most necessary materials for raising the Edifice, and disposed above 50 Ministers of *Hiram, to hew the trees of Lebanon*, who would in some one of their Synods have declared themselves. He had peradventure mingled together *gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble: Every mans work shall be manifested, for the day of our Lord shall declare it; and fire shall try what the work of every one is: If any mans work burn, it shall be lost.* However it be, God granted him not the honour of raising this Structure, much less of seeing it brought to perfection. That glory he hath reserved for you. The first course of stones, in laying the foundation of this House, ought to be that wherewith I now present you, *these corner stones, to make the two parties into one, and break down the middle wall of partition.*

'Tis incredible, in what number, and with what applause *the strangers of the house of God* flock'd to the Church of S. *Germain Des-prez*, as also with what constancy they continued it, when (not only by command, but of my own inclination) I laid the first course of all these stones orally in my Sermons, and in small printed Pamphlets, which I published the same weeks,

weeks, that ſo theſe things might firmlier be retained, and more attentively conſider'd. The Title I gave them was, *The Meanes of Chriſtian Peace.* This I continued for ſome years; I mean *the Doctrine of the Catholique Faith exactly ſever'd from all other*, upon theſe Subjects, *viz. Of Merits: of the Primacy of the Church, eſpecially of that reſiding in the Pope: Of the Euchariſt, and Adoration of Chriſt therein: Of the Sacrifiie of the Maſs: Of the honour given to Saints, and their Images and Reliques: and of praying to them: Of Satisfaction, even for others: Of Purgatory, and Prayers for the dead Of the Treaſure of the Church, and Indulgences.*

The diſownings I made on every of theſe Subjects, in each Sermon, and the miſunderſtanding of our Doctrine which I demonſtrated, did ſo amaze, qualifie, and change all thoſe of *Charenton* then preſent among whom were many of divers Provinces and Towns, even of the moſt obſtinate in their Separatiſm) that at their departure from the Church, they ſaid, in a manner aloud; *They could willingly receive the Catholique Doctrine, in caſe it were ſuch, and no other, and ſhould perſwade their brethren to imbrace it.*

And had not ſome perſons, (whom I will take for Zealots, and but ill inſtructed

in our Religion, as well as ignorant in Divi-
nity, not having frequented those Schools
and whose zeal was like that reprehended
by S. *Paul*, *which is not according to knowledge*,
had not those, I say, possest the ears o
some Learned men, and by their means th
ears also of certain Great Ones, spreading
false Report; *That I slackned some points*
our Religion (an execrable Sacriledge;) th
I proposed accommodations in Faith, with
pretending that the Separatists should come
to us intirely; *that I preach'd up a third Pa*
that I adher'd to one, *who troubled the pret*
ded Reformers, *yet was not himself sufficien*
disingaged from their crime; *that I was*, *as it wer*
his Conductor, *and the Supporter of his Error*
then mingled with our Catholique Truths, whic
within these Moneths he has embrac'd int
and clear from all exceptions; If those Calum
ators had not, I say, by their false rumors inte
rupted my course in laying these Fundament
stones three several times, during the spa
of three Voyages made by his Majes
(though upon the dissipation of that Calu
ny, I as often resumed the work) th
foundations, *and the beginning of the build*
had appear'd long since above ground, espe
ally, *in the last National Synod of the Mi*
sters, the principal Architect having, so lo
as he lived, at his dissosal, all that was
quis

quisite for the intire raising of this great Building; especially the defraying of persons imployed, the interposition of sundry Laborers, the Sermons of many Learned men, and whatever else; and having so begun, that even after his death, in the Provincial Synod of *Charenton*, held in *January* last, there were many of the Assembled well-disposed to listen to the commenced Treaty of Peace; but no man appeared on our part to promote the design, the chief Undertaker being deceased, and a long Sickness tying me to my bed, disabled me for all sollicitation, which is pressingly requisite in a business of this nature.

True it is, that from the time of the said Death to this day, I have forborn to speak of this Subject, as well in my publick Sermons or Lessons Royal of Controversie, as in my Writings, to avoid the Scandal, which perchance some *mis-informed persons* might have taken thereat; besides, my endeavours would have prov'd but vain and effectless, who am only capable of being *instrumental* to another; saving that on the occasion of the above-mentioned *Provincial Synod* of the *Ministers*, held upon the very Territory of my Flock at *Charenton*, I caus'd to be presented to them, in full Synod, this RULE, solemnly approved

proved by ſeveral Doctors, hereafter mentioned.

But now, beholding you aſſembled, to whom alone appertains this great Enterprize of the Converſion, and general Reduction of thoſe of the pretended Reformed Religion, to the Catholique, Apoſtolique, and Roman Church, to your Folds, from whence they ſtrayed, principally by their *miſ-underſtandings* of the Doctrine you teach, I preſent my ſelf to your Lordſhips, humbly beſeeching to be heard on this Subject, in your full Aſſembly, ſuccinctly now, hereafter more at large before your Commiſſaries, who may examine the Contents of this *Book*, and the whole deſign, whereby to make you a faithfull and ſolid Report thereof; whereupon you may pleaſe to take ſuch reſolutions as your great Zeal and Learning ſhall ſuggeſt to you touching this Work; either to take it in hand, and perfect it, or, if the Conjuncture of affairs will not now permit, at leaſt to approve this *Rule*, and the Applications of it, by your high Authorities, who are *our onely proper Judges* with Juriſdiction, of the Doctrine, which all ſhall receive from your Sacred mouths, as undoubtedly proceeding from the Church; this being the ſole thing that ſeems deſired by many of the Separatiſts, for their returning to the Catholique Communion. Theſe are the

Prayers

Prayers he offers, and this the Account he gives you of his Actions, since your last general Assembly, who is,

(My Lords).

Your most humble and

Charenton, 15. *Sept.* 1645.

obedient Servant

and Missioner,

Francis Veron.

THE

THE Names of those Doctors, who approved this BOOK, and the Contents thereof, and whose particular Approbations are printed at large in the first Edition hereof in French, and their Names only inserted in the second, which this Translation follows.

Jaques Hennequin: Hemeré: Severtius: du Fresne de Mince: Chapelas: Canta: Brousse: Judas: de Machi: Flavigny: de St. Simon: de Fountaines: Fremont: Marechau.

The CONTENTS.

The Authors Preface.

Chap. 2. *The Genetal Rule of the Catholick Faith,* Page 1.

Chap. 3. *Particular Matters : of Merit and Inherent Justice,* 15

Chap. 4. *Of the Pope,* 24

Chap. 5. *Of the Eucharist,* 37

Chap. 6. *Of the Sacrifice of the Mass,* 44

Chap. 7. *Of the Adoration of the Eucharist,* 51

Chap. 8. *Of the Honor due to Saints,* 59

Chap. 9. *Of the Invocation of Saints,* 62

Chap. 10. *Of the Honor given to Images,* 71

Chap. 11. *Of Satisfaction,* 80

Chap. 12. *Of Satisfactions, and Merits for another man,* 90

Chap. 13. *Concerning the Treasure of Satisfaction from the Merits of Saints,* 96

Chap. 14. *Of Purgatory,* 99

Chap. 15. *Of Suffrages for the dead* 103

Chap. 16. *Of Indulgences,* 108

Chap. 17. *What certainty there is in the aforesaid Doctrines,* 116

Chap. 18. *What is less certain concerning Indulgences,* 122

Chap. 19. *Of the Obligation due to Constitutions and humane Laws, as well Ecclesiastical as Civil* 128

Chap. 20. *Concerning some Errors proceeding from Ignorance, which ought to be laid aside,* 136

Chap. 21. *The benefit of thus separating Faith from Opinions,* 141

ERRATA.

PAge 9.l 3 r. *Article.* p.12.l 2. for *out* r. *ought.* l. 25. r. *facto.* p.16.l.11.r. *Durandus.* ibid. r. *rejected.* p. 17.l.13.r. *; for God.* p.19.l.16.r. *modern* l.23.r. *effected.* p.27.l.3.r. *to the.* p. 32.l.1.r. *guided.* l 15.r. *do.* p.72.l.25 r. *Schools* p.87.l.29.r. *greater.* p.116.l.11. dele *from.* p. 126.l.28.r. *Sacrament.*

The

IT much imports, both in Political and Spiritual wars, as well for defence of places besieged, to retrench themselves strongly and abandon those Outworks that are either untenable or unprofitable; as in the Attaque of others to assault safely, when the breach is fair, and the force sufficient to carry the Town: I intend by this, to our purpose, that the Means *particularly proper, whether to maintain our* Catholick Religion *against all sorts of Sectaries, or to convince them of their Errours, and reduce them to the antient Unity, is,* Exactly to Separate the Articles of our Catholick Faith; *To wit, such as all are obliged to submit to, under pain of Heresie, and Excommunication, from those other Doctrines, which have not attained so high dignity, and which we commonly term* Scholastical Questions, *the greater part whereof are esteem'd only Problematical, and the other (whatever their certitude is) are not held to be of Faith, as also from some Opinions and abuses, which by the ignorant zeal of weak brains, have gained scoring among the Vulgar, much to the prejudice of Religion.*

These I intend exactly to separate from those other, which are truly controverted betwixt us and our Adversaries, yet still with a just regard due to the several Opinions, condemning onely the Abuses, and in a word to represent to the Reader the Catholick Doctrine in her native beauty, full

of splendor and vigor, against the suprizal of our Opposites, who with much Art and fraud endeavor to make her appear ugly and deformed, and by that means more than any other, foment the present Divisions, representing to their followers our Church quite other than it is.

Many too, I confess, of our modern Preachers and Doctors, not understanding, or not well discerning what is of Faith, and what is disputable in the Schools, have so confounded their Doctrine, as thereby divers have been retarded in their submission to the Church, and many stand at a distance, who (were they rightly informed) would willingly submit to the Catholick Doctrines; which, if represented in their own purity, are clear and manifest in the Divine Oracles, in the Councils, and in all Antiquities; but if mingled with the Opinions of the Schools, lose much of their solidity. In short, misunderstanding both on one side and on the other contributes much to this Division; and I dare pronounce, that this misunderstanding is so generally the cause of our differences, that if in 30 or 40 points debated between us, we should agree to take it away, two thirds of the Controversies would cease, and we should immediately find our selves so far united.

It is now 25 years since I first made good this reduction, both in my Sermons and Books, as also in very many Conferences with several Ministers, even in the parts of France, most infect-

with Heresie, and this with so great an improvement, that thousands have been gained to the Catholick Church, and rested safe in her bosome. I have also, for some years past, in this City of Paris continued the same method in my Sermons, with great concourse of both parties, in a hopeful way of reducing France to the exercise of one sole Religion; (A thing much to be desired both for the good of souls, and tranquility of the Civil Government:) But certain persons, either ill informed or ignorant, have by another kind of misunderstanding still posed and counterpointed my endeavours.

I intend here amply to explain my self, without offence to any, that the clearness of my proceeding may remove the mistake, and afford some benefit to the Reader. For, to perform this work exactly, it is necessary to be well vers'd as well in Controversie as School-Divinity, and particularly in the Authors of these times, (a perfection few attain to) and since our Ministers of France have little of School-Divinity among them, they can hardly arrive at the knowledg of a just separation in what belongs to Faith, and what to Opinion; Besides that often upon malice, and to foment a division, whatsoever Bellarmin, or any other Author writes (though not in quality of an Article of Faith, but expresly delivering it as a problematical Opinion belonging to the Schools) they confidently oppose, as the Doctrine of the Church. Bellarmin, saith du Moulin, (who writes as

the

Popes feet) saith, thus and thus, not taking notice at all that what he delivers is onely by way of opinion.

On the contrary, most of our Divines employ themselves wholly, during their promotion in the University, to School-Divinity, few or none to Controversie, their exercises altogether consisting in the subtle and sublime Doctrine of the Schools. From thence they betake themselves either to the pulpit or Government of the Church. How is it possible that these men should be exact in controversie? few addicting themselves at all to that study, and scarce any that continue long, and grow aged in the employment, and yet far more scarce is the number of such as have well digested both the practical and speculative part by frequent Communications and Conferences with our Adversaries, though the dignity of this cause requires many should be compleated in that study, and the parts that compose it, as Scripture, Councils, Fathers, Languages, Histories, besides School-Divinity.

From hence results, as a necessary Consequence, that this exact separation cannot be made without an accurate knowledg of those Points that ought to be distinguish'd, and that the number is but small of such as are able to perform this work; yet, what can their be more suitable to reason, than onely to propose, in matter of Faith, what is necessary? Why should we oblige such as

are

we got to be reduced to submit to more then what the Church proposeth? Is there not difficulty enough to perswade them to this? is not the contrary a means to divert them? Does it not savour of inhumanity, to make the way harder then it is of its own nature? whereas we are obliged in reason and by Divine Precept to render the burthen light, and the yoke easie.

For these Reasons I thought it expedient to deliver by way of Preface my sence of this exact Separation, that we may collect into one, what hereafter will be dilated in several subjects. First, I establish the General Rule of Faith, and then I distinguish in each particular matter that which is of obligation to be believed, from all other Doctrines whatsoever, as well by the Application of this Rule, as by fortifying my self with the Opinions of our most renowned modern Divines, that I may not appear particular in mine own.

'Tis true, none of our Doctors have yet published to the world this Rule, accompanied with these exact Applications, and yet I offer nothing contrary to their sence, but rather what is generally agreed upon; insomuch that if my words be not abus'd by Additions or Misunderstandings, but taken as I speak them, no man can oppose this Doctrine, without contradicting the general Tenet of our Divines, and incurring the censure of introducing a Novelty. For you

must

must note particularly, that when I say, such a Proposition is not an Article of Faith, I do not intend thereby to deny the Truth of it, in which many are easily deceived, but since my intention is, to perswade them to be Catholicks, who are not in the Church, what need I undertake to teach them more then what conduceth to that end? Or, why should I perplex their understandings with unnecessary Questions? for my part I take my self bound to pass over such points with silence; now, Abstrahentium non est mendacium. When I call this Reduction or Conversion of our Adversaries A Reunion, 'tis to be understood, of persons, not of Doctrines, which can be no more united then the light with darkness, but as they separated themselves from the Church by Heresie, either in adhering to their Parents, or upon the score of their own particular Opinions, so, by an entire Profession of Catholick verities, they are re-united, and freed from excommunication, by the hands of those to whom God Almighty hath bestowed the power of Absolution: and this is the full Sum of my Invention in this Preface.

CHAP.

CHAP. 2.

The GENERAL RULE of the Catholique Faith.

THe total and only *Rule* of the *Catholique Faith*, to which all are obliged, under pain of Hereſie and Excommunication, is, DIVINE REVELATION DELIVERED TO THE PROPHETS AND APOSTLES, PROPOSED BY THE CATHOLIQUE CHURCH IN HER GENERAL COUNCILS, OR BY HER UNIVERSAL PRACTICE, TO BE BELIEVED AS AN ARTICLE OF CATHOLIQUE FAITH. All that is of this nature, is an *Article* or Doctrine of *Faith*; And no other Doctrine can be of Faith, if either the firſt Condition fail, to wit, Divine Revelation, or the ſecond, which is, a Propoſal by the Univerſal Church. All other Doctrines are of an inferiour allay, certain or probable, true or falſe, according to their ſeveral circumſtances and qualities.

According to this *General Rule*, which hath no exception, all that is deſign'd and propos'd, as Doctrine, revealed by God in General Councils, or by the general practice of the Church, is an *Article of Faith*; ſuch for

example is that which is contained in the usual form of our Profession of Faith, extracted by Pope *Pius* the 4th. out of the Council of *Trent*, (in which he presided by his Legates) or out of any other General Council.

For want of either or both of these conditions requisite, there can be no Article of Faith. No Doctrine is to be believed with Divine Faith since the Apostles times, though even miracles have been done in confirmation of it; nor any Revelation to any Saint, since the Apostles, contained in the Lives of Saints; nor any Miracle reported in their Legends ought to be believed as of Faith, though the Miracles were written by most holy persons, as S. *Jerome*, S. *Athanasius*, S. *Austin*, S. *Gregory* the Great, or any other never so grave Author, or even reported and approved by General Councils, as, by that of the second of *Nice*, *act.* 4. and that of *Basil*, concerning the Revelations of S. *Bridget*, or in the *Buls* of the Canonization of Saints: The reason is, that either both the two conditions or one of them is wanting in all those instances: the Revelations are not made either to the Prophets or Apostles, nor the Miracles performed by them: Neither is it, for the most part, the Universal Church that proposeth them, but some particular men; and if

if the Authors be grave, their Teſtimony will carry more or leſs Authority with it, (yet ſtill but humane) according to their different qualities.

Some of theſe Writers, as *Jacobus de Voragine* in his Golden Legend, *Simon Metaphraſtes* in the Saints Lives, and particularly, in thoſe of S. *Chriſtopher*, S. *George*, S. *Urſula*, S. *Margaret*, and ſeveral other Martyrs, do relate divers paſſages much to the prejudice of truth, and diſhonor of the Saints, which are learnedly corrected both by *Baronius*, and *Ribadinera*. And yet in their Works may ſtill remain ſomething uncertain, or falſe, according to the credit of the Authors by whom they were guided. But, in fine, (as I ſaid before) nothing of all this belongs to *Catholique Faith*, but only to humane Authority: As alſo the Miracles reported by S. *Auſtin*, and other grave Authors, though they confirm the Catholique Faith, yet are they not the *Foundation* of it.

No Doctrine grounded upon Scripture, diverſly interpreted either by the Ancient Fathers, or our Modern Doctors, is an Article of Faith; For, ſuch a Doctrine, though it may be revealed, yet the Revelation is not aſcertain'd to us, nor propoſed by the Church; and I inſiſt only upon that ſcore. Nor can thoſe Doctrines, (which we properly call

School Divinity, and whose nature 'tis to be disputable) be esteemed within the compass of Faith; nor any Proposition which can be proved onely by Consequences drawn from Scripture, although the Consequences were certain and evident, and deduced from two Propositions of Scripture, much less, which commonly happens, when one Proposition onely is from the Revealed Word. These Doctrines are notwithstanding certain, when the Premisses are so; and probable, when the Premisses arrive no higher: This commonly happens in the debate of School-questions, which never come within the compass of Faith; much less do the Arguments of our Adversaries, in points controverted, who pretend no farther then by deductions out of Scripture to prove their assertions, which, were they true, yet could not be of Faith.

As for *Gratians Decrees*, and the *Glosse*, they can claim nothing of Faith, the Author being a particular Doctor, and subject to many mistakes, even in the citation of Authors, nor does he pretend to any such thing; much less weight has the Glosse, then the Decrees, where many silly and ridiculous passages are discovered.

As for the Papal Decrees, contained in the body of the Canon Law, or published since

none

none of them do constitute an Article of Faith; for, certainly the greatest part of these Decretals contained in the body of the Canon Law, are but Rules of Government and Policy for the Bishops Courts, by which the Judges are directed in deciding causes, and principally in collating Benefices. Besides these, there are in them very many particular Answers of Popes to some Bishops; but how they should come to be deemed Articles of Faith; I cannot so much as guess. *Bellarmine*, who, (to use *du Moulins* Phrase) writes at the Popes feet, maketh no difficulty to acknowledg errours in several of them. As for example, where the Canon out of *Gratian* is objected, *Quod propositisti*: extracted out of *Gregory* the Third, where it is said, *That if a woman should be sick, and by that means unable to render her duty to her husband, the husband if he have not the gift of continency, may take another wife*: He replyeth thus, *That the Pope fail'd, through ignorance, which we do not deny may happen to Popes, when they do not properly define, but onely declare their opinions, as* Gregory *seems here to have done.* This answer of the Cardinal shews, how little force there is in any Objection drawn from the Decretals, since in these the Popes declare only their

Controv. de Pontif. Romano. lib 4. ch. 12.

their Opinions, without defining what is of Faith.

That also is not esteemed an Article of Faith, which is defined in Provincial Councils, though the Pope should preside in person, or by his Legates; and the reason is, that the second condition is alwayes wanting in this case, and very often the first. *Bellarmine*, lib. 4. cap. 2. treating this subject in the foresaid Controversie, produces three Opinions currant among Catholiques; the first, that the Pope, as Pope, may be an Heritique, and teach Herisie, if he doth define without a General Council; some Doctors of *Paris* have defended this Opinion, as *Gerson* and *Almanus*, in their Books of Ecclesiastical Power. *Alphonsus de Castro* against Heresies, and Pope *Adrian* in the Question of Conformation. These seem to place the judgement of *Infallibility* in matters of Faith, not in the Pope alone, but in the whole Church, that is in the Pope, and a General Council. The second, whether the Pope may be an Heritique, or no, yet he cannot define any thing Heretical, directed to the whole Church. The third Opinion is, that the Pope cannot in any wayes be an Heretick, nor publickly teach Heresie, though he undertake to define of himself.

The first Opinion is not properly Heretical; since we see the Church censures not those that

that maintain it, yet, it seems very Erronious, and next to Herisie. The second is the most certain, and to be affirmed. The third is probable, but not certain: Thus *Bellarmine*; whom I therefore have so largely cited, to wipe away their Calumny who blame me for saying, *That the Difinitions of the Pope*, ex Cathedra, *out of a General Council, are not of Catholique Faith*; which I again so affirm, that I conclude it a most certain truth, according to the Opinion of all Doctors, even *Bellarmine* himself; who expresly sayes, the first Opinion is not Heretical; nor do I agree with *Bellarmine*, that it is Erronious, and next to Heresie, and himself indeed sayes it but tenderly, and with a *videtur*: For, it doth not seem so to all, who think it rather timerious, to accuse *Gerson*, *Almainus*, and *Adrianus*, of erronious, and near-heretical Opinions.

Besides, its evident, even out of *Bellarmine*, that it is not defin'd by the Church, that the Pope (not in a General Council) is infallible, nor his Definitions of *Catholique Faith*: so that all Divines agree, that *such* a Doctrine is not of *Catholique Faith*; this was all I said, and is most certain; which my Calumniators, through precipitancy of judgement, observed not.

Which of these three Opinions I follow, is not

to

to my purpose, yet, I rather adhere to the second, but without censuring the first, my business being to reduce Separatists to the Catholique Faith, without medling with any other Doctrine. I did not say, that such Definitions were not of Faith, as my Adversaries conceived, but I only said, and I say it again, That they are not of *Catholique Faith*, or which all, as Catholiques, are bound to hold, as of Faith, and the contrary to which is Heretical, and removes from the bosome of the Church; yet do all confess, what is decreed by the Bishop of so great a See, is of weighty Authority, though only assisted by his private Council, or writing only privately to some Bishops; and yet of more weight are his Decrees in a Provincial Synod, but most of all when *ex Cathedra*, proposing such Decrees to the whole Church, either in his private Council, or Provincial Synod; and 'tis a rashness not to admit such Determinations.

Wherefore these Censurers proceed too hastily, and their Censure deserves a Censure, as offering to introduce a new Doctrine to be believed as of Catholique Faith, which no one as yet has held; to wit, that what is defin'd by the Pope *ex Cathedra* (out of a General Council) is of *Catholique Faith*, and to be believed under pain of Heresie.

The

The practice even of the Universal Church is no sufficient ground for an Artikle of Catholique Faith, by reason the Object of Faith is *Truth*; and often times the Church proceeds in matter of Practice, upon probable Opinions, and this probability is sufficient to justifie the practice, which the Church also upon just cause may change. As for example, *Vasquez* teacheth, that the Church did anciently pray in the Mass for Infidels alive, and Catecumens dead; and that the Sacrifice of the Mass was offered for them; and yet he holds it but a probable Opinion, and rather inclines to the contrary, that the Sacrifice of the Mass ought not to be offer'd but for the Faithful living and dead; by which Opinion the Church seems guided at present: But *Vasquez* Answers is, that the Church following a probable Opinion did practice that which she did not declare to be Faith, as appears by the contrary practice now in use. *Vide Int. Edit.* p. 526.

3 p. *disp.* 228. ch. 3.

The Church often times (as *Vasquez* very well noteth) confirms a Definition by some Testimonies which do not directly prove the Proposition. And yet, when the Fathers in a General Council affirm, that this is gathered from this or that place, or that Author, who dare say that the Foundation is weak and uncertain?

3 p. *disp.* 228. ch. 9.

Bellarmine raising an Objection upon the words of *Boniface* the 8th, *Quare quam de cenſibus*, &c. That the Clergy is exempt from Taxes by Divine right, teacheth the contrary, and anſwers, that *Boniface* was of the Canoniſts Opinion, and delivered his ſence accordingly, but defin'd nothing; for he ſpeaks not by way of definition in a controverted point, but only by way of ſimple aſſertion, and as it were *en paſſant*: The ſame may be affirmed of General Councils; when they mention any thing in this manner and do not properly define; For, as the ſame Author affirms, it is neceſſary, that General Conuncils *properly* define the thing in queſtion, as a Decree which ought to be held as of Catholique Faith. Hence *Bellarmine* adds, they are not properly Hereticks, who hold the Pope not to be above all Councils, though he ſay, the laſt *Lateran* Council, under *Leo* the tenth, Seſſ. 11. expreſly and profeſſedly teaches, that the Pope is above all Councils, and rejects the contrary Decree made in the Council of *Baſil*; becauſe 'tis doubtful whether the *Lateran* Council defin'd that Doctrine properly, as a Decree to be beleived with Catholique Faith, and ſo they are not properly Hereticks, that maintain the contrary.

Tom. 1 lib. *de claſſicis*, c. 28.

lib. 2. *de Conciliis*, cap. 17.

The

The same *Bellarmin*, (lib 2. *of Councils*, c. 19.) also requires, that the Definition be made Conciliarly; *P. Martin* the fifth said, he only confirm'd those Decrees of Faith; which were made in the Council of *Constance*, *conciliariter*, *i. e.* after the manner of other Councils, the Question being first diligently examined: But 'tis clear (says he) that this Decree of a General Council, having immediate Authority from Christ, which all, even the Pope are bound to obey, was made without any examining; So that *Martin* confirming all Decrees conciliarly made, intended onely the condemnation of *Wickliff* and *Huß*.

Hence follows, that the *Depositive* or the ordering of Chapters and Canons is not belonging to faith, but onely the Canons and Definitions themselves. *Vasques* also affirms, 3 p. *disp.* 207. c. 3. that all that is taught by the Council, in the Chapters preceding the Canons belonging to Doctrine, (meaning the decreeing, not the introductive part) is of Faith, and the contrary an Error, and he that adheres to it an Heretick.

The Object defined must be truly and properly an Object of Faith; such, for example, is not this following Question, *Whether the use may be separated from the power in things that are consum'd by use, as bread, &c.* Or any other Question of Law, or Philosophy; and a De-

cree out to be upon a thing universally propos'd to the whole Church, According to the same Author, it is not at all erroneous to affirm, that a general Council may erre in Precepts, and in particular Judgments, and having made an Objection, that Pope *Innocent* the 8th. had permitted those of *Norway* to celebrate Mass without Wine (which is undoubtedly an Error,) He replies, that the said Pope made no Decree, whereby he declared to the whole Church, that it is lawful to offer Sacrifice without Wine; wherefore he has err'd in fact, but not in Doctrine.

ch. 25.

ch. 14.

The same Author having raised to himself this Objection, That Pope *Stephen* had commanded to re-ordain those that formerly were ordain'd by the Anti-pope *Formosus*, and consequently, the judging that the first Ordination was not valid, was an unquestionable Error, *Formosus*, being at least a Bishop, answers thus, Pope *Steven* made no Decree by which he defin'd that those who were ordain'd by a degraded Bishop, should be reordained, but *de facto* did this in prosecution of his passion or hatred, not out of Ignorance or Heresie.

ch. 4.

The same Author assures us, that it is no Error to say, the Pope or general Council may erre in framing Laws, not necessary

ch. 5.

to

in Salvation, or of things indifferent, or making Superfluous Laws, or under too great a penalty. And moreover, that a General Council may erre in particular matters of fact, which depend upon the Testimony and Information of men. According to which he adds, that the sixth General Council, condemned Pope *Honorius* of Heresie by false Information, ch. 11 and by misunderstanding the Epistles of *Honorius*, for, without all doubt, a General Council may erre in a Question of Fact.

I shall further add this particular out of *Suarez*, Although the Pope in the grant of an Indulgence declares expressly, that he is moved thereunto by such a cause, which he conceives sufficient for the aforesaid grant; That man would not be thought deficient in faith, that should question the sufficiency of the cause, and consequently the validity of the Indulgence; for this declaration of the Pope doth not at all belong to faith, but to a particular action, depending upon humane prudence, in which the Pope hath no infallible assistance from the Holy Ghost, but onely in what belongs to Faith, according to this Text of S. *Luke*, ch. 22. v. 32. *I have prayed for thee PETER, that thy faith may not fail*: This is prudently noted by *Suarez*, according to which it is far from being of Faith, that such or such an Excommunication is valid,

Tom. 4. disp. 56. of *Indul.* Sect. 3.

or,

or, that such or such a Kingdome is dispoſeable by the Pope for such or such causes.

I have now ended concerning the general way of separating matters of faith, from all other Doctrines; Let us supply to our particular controversies, which we shall countenance with the Authority of our most renowned modern Doctors, that there may be no doubt of the solidity of this *Rule*. And from hence will appear that the points controverted are much fewer then are commonly esteemed, and the way to an accord more easie which, I hope, will facilitate an Agreement, and Subscription from our Separatists to the undoubted Articles of the *Catholick Church*.

CHAP.

CHAP. 3.

Particular matters: Of Merit and Inherent Justice.

LEt us now descend to particular matters about which our Adversaries contend with us.

Concerning *Merits*, its an Article of Faith, That A MAN JUSTIFIED, TRULY DESERVES LIFE EVERLASTING BY HIS GOOD WORKS; For, this is the Definition of the Council of *Trent*; But, as it is not there defin'd, that these *Merits* are *of Justice*, or *of Fidelity*, or *of Condignity*, or *of Congruity*; so none of all these Particulars are of Faith. *Sess. 6. Can. 32.*

There are (saith *Bellarmine*) 3 Questions among our Schoolmen: The first, If Merits of the Just ought to be so termed, from *Condignity*, or from *Congruity*? The second, If this *Condignity* proceeds from the promise, or from the work? The third, Whether God rewards the works of the Just above, and the works of the Impious below their Condignity? As for the first Question, all Catholicks agree, that *the works of the Just, are meritorious of Eternal Life*; but some would have these Terms of *Con-* *lib. 5. of Justif. c. 16.*

Condignity and *Congruity* laid aside, and rather say, the works of the Just are meritorious of Life Everlasting by the Grace of God. Thus teacheth *Thomas Waldensis*, &c. Others will have the good works of the Just meritorious by *Condignity*, but this *Condignity* so expounded as that it rather signifies *Congruity*. This Opinion is owned by *Durandus Gregorius*, &c. but the most Common Opinion amongst Divines admits only a merit of *Congruity*. The Opinion of *Durandus* were not to be rejected, if he intended no farther then that our merits are not by Condignity, or absolute Justice, but only presupposing the liberal Promise of God, but, he seems to intend, that our Merits, proceeding from the Grace of God, and the Promise presupposed, are not at all such as that any recompence is due to them by Justice, but by the sole liberality of God; *Vasquez* lib. 1 *disp.* 115. chap. 1. also is of Opinion, that nothing is due by Justice, but onely by the Promise of God.

As to the second Question, whether our *good works* are meritorious by *Condignity* in respect of the Pact onely, or in respect of the work only, or in respect of the one and the other. There are who hold, that *good works* proceeding from Grace, are not meritorious by *Condignity*, by reason of the work, but in respect of the Promise, and the Divine acceptation.

nion. This is taught by *Scotus*, and divers an-
ent School-men, and by the Modern *Vega*.
These hold, that the works of the just are really
d properly good, but that they are not of
at excellency as proportionable to Eternal
ife, but only as they are accepted of God as a
t recompence of Eternal Life, yet still with
elation to the pact and promise, not to the
Dignity of the work. The other opinion seems
o us more probable, which teacheth, that the
ood works of the just are meritorious of eter-
al life by Condignity, in a joint respect of the
act, and the work for; God is not obliged to
ccept this work, as to so great a recompence,
f his Covenant did not induce him to it. And
ere I cannot but note, that *Mostrezat* did falſ-
y cite the Cardinal, as delivering this Doctrine
or an Article of Faith; whereas it is onely pro-
uced as an opinion of the Schools.

As to the third Question, whether God Al-
ighty doth not reward good works beyond
heir Condignity? The affirmative is the con-
ant opinion of the Schools, hitherto *Bellar-*
ine.

What concerns merit for another man, though
y congruity, is no Article of Faith, no not the
onversion of a sinner, nor any other favour
hatsoever; For the Council proposeth no
uch thing, as will hereafter more fully appear.

As for good works in particular, and *in ſpecie*,

if you demand which of them are meritorious of Eternal Life? I answer, It is not an Article of Faith, that any good work, either of Justice, Temperance, Fortitude, Hope, or any other Vertue, (except Charity) are meritorious of Life everlasting, though proceeding from the grace of God, and done by such as are already in the state of grace. The Proof is certain, for we have not received the contrary by any clear Revelation: Nor does the Council of *Trent* at all meddle with it; and, at the best, it is onely deducible by consequence; but (as I said before) we do not build, as upon a certainty, what is gathered by consequences, though they seem deduced either from Scripture, or from the Decree of a General Council.

l. 2. *disp.* 117. chap. 1. *Vasquez*, in this point of *Merit*, says the first opinion is of such who affirm, that those only good works are meritorious, which proceed from the commanpment of Charity. This opinion is taught by *Scotus*, *Gabriel*, *Durandus*, and *Bellarmin* himself, who delivers it as the most frequent Doctrine of the Schools, and yet the Ministers impose upon the Church, as if she taught for an Article of Faith, that Fasting, Mortification, and other exteriour works, or the Monastical Vows of Chastity, Poverty, and Obedience are meritorious of Eternal Happiness, and that in them consists the Perfection of Sanctity, where-

as

as we consider them only as the way and means to Charity, which is onely of it self deemed meritorious of Everlasting Life. And here I will conclude all those Books and Writings useless and vain, which impose this Calumny upon the Church,

As for *Justice*, to use the words of the Council of *Trent*, *If any shall say, Men are justified either by the only Imputation of Christs Justice, or by the only Remission of sinnes, excluding Grace and Charity, which by the Holy Ghost is poured into their hearts; or, that the Grace whereby we are justified, is onely the favour of God*; Anathema. This is the Doctrine of the Catholick Church; but it is not of Faith that this Inherent Justice is a habit

Some Modern Divines (according to *Vasques*) hold it as a thing already defin'd, though still controverted, to wit, whether the Church had defin'd it, or that it belongs to Faith, that the Justice, by which sinners are justified, be a quality and habit permanent in the soul, or whether this Justification may be affected as well by the affection of Love towards God, and contrition for sin? and whether all that is said of our Justice in Scriptures, Councils and Fathers, may remain good, if one should affirm, That inherent Justice is the affection of the Love of God, and of contrition for sin. The Title of his third Chap. is, That it is not defin'd as yet, Whether

l. 2. *disp.* 203. ch. 2.

those that are come to the age of discretion are justified without the Sacrament, by a habit only: And in the 6th *Chap.* The Church hath not yet expressly declar'd, that the justification of little children, and of those that are justified by attrition onely, and by help of the Sacrament, is done by some habit: Hitherto *Vasques.*

I argue therefore thus, in behalf of our *General Rule of Faith.* Since neither the Council of *Trent*, nor any other General Council doth evidently propose this Doctrine to be believed, neither concerning people at the age of Discretion, nor Infants baptized, nor of Justification effected by vertue of the Sacrament, nor, of that done out of the Sacrament, it cannot be esteemed an Article of Catholick Faith. I do not deny what *Suarez* saith in prosecution of this, That he conceives, it clearly follows from the definition of the Church, that both little Infants, and those of the age of Discretion, who obtain remission of their sinnes by vertue of the Sacrament, are justified by a permanent habit, and quality. But since this is onely deduced by way of consequence, drawn from the Proposal of the Church, 'tis not of Faith; it being probable, That no Doctrine which is not expresly proposed by the Church, but drawn by consequence from her Decrees, is an Article of Faith. To little purpose therefore do our Adversaries con-

conteſt with us about the Doctrine of Habit, ſince, in that they oppoſe not the Church at all.

Hence 'tis, that *Meſtrezat* (Miniſter of *Charenton.*) with ſome others, hath utteſted the Catholique Faith in the Matter of *Merit* and *Juſtification*, inſtead of oppoſing it, and purely by a miſtake of the ſaid Doctrine, whilſt he writes thus in his Diſcourſe of Grace: *We do acknowledge, that good works obtain Eternal Life, only, we would have it obtained by Benignity, Grace, Goodneſs, and the mercy of God: and ſo we do not reject the word (merit) nor to merit, according to the ſence of the Latin word. And moreover we confeſs, we receive the Kingdom of heaven, as a remuneration of our good works, and diſpute only of the nature of this remuneration, to wit, if it be of Grace, Bounty, and Mercy, or of rigor of Juſtice by a condignity of the work.* And again, If you ſay, that Remuneration is due by rigor of Juſtice, and by condignity of the work, which is the Tenet of the *Roman* Church, citing *Bellarmine*, how can there be a more groſs miſtake, then to charge the Church with this, as a Doctrine of Faith, and yet openly to acknowledge as much, or rather more then the Church teacheth in matters of Merit; for the Church holds no more, but that the

pag. 25.

pag. 28.

pag. 7.

de Juſtif. lib. 5. c. 17.

the works of Charity only have for reward Eternal Life: Whereas, *Mestrezat* confesseth the same of all good works in general; and in that sayes more then is necessary for a Catholique to say. The same Author speaks thus concerning inherent Justice; *Inherent*
pag. 35. *Justice, which is the renewing of our*
Souls in Sanctity and Christian Vertues, hath a
being in our Salvation. And again,
pag. 40. *Regeneration and Sanctification produce*
in us inherent Justice. God doth not impute inhe-
rent Justice, but produces it in us. As for
pag. 37. *his Spirit, it is derived to us by Regene-*
ration, as the habitual corruption of Adam is
produced in us by natural generation. Behold our Minister here clearly a Catholique, and professing something beyond the Article of Faith; for he teaches, that inherent Justice is habitual, and doth not only acknowledge it in Charity, but in all other Christian Vertues. And the same I have (upon another occasion) Two *French* demonstrated against *Testard* and Ministers. *Amirant.*

As for our *Satisfaction*, the same is to be said, as of *Merits*, to wit, that it is an Article of Faith according to the Definition of the
Sess. 14. Council of *Trent*. *After Justifi-*
can. 12, 13, 14. *cation there sometimes remain some*
Sess 6. can. 30. *temporal pains to pay, for which we*
satisfie by Fasting, Prayers, &c. But it is not of Faith,

Faith, that by these works we satisfie by way of Condignity or by Justice, or by the rigor of Justice, or by the mercy of God: Nor, that our Satisfactions are properly satisfactory, but rather an application of the satisfactions of Jesus Christ; nor that we can satisfie for the pains due to other mens sins, and communicate unto them our Satisfactions. The Reason is, that nothing of all this is propounded as of Faith, by the Council of *Trent*, nor any other General Council, as hereafter more at large will appear.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Of the POPE.

THat which is contained in our Profeſſion of Faith, is by all Catholiques ſubmitted to, as an Article of Faith, *I believe that the Pope of* Rome *is Succeſſor of St.* Peter, *and Vicar of* Jeſus Chriſt *upon earth*; *I do acknowledge the Holy Catholique Apoſtolique* Roman *Church, as Mother and Miſtreſs of all other Churches*: Words taken out of the Council of *Trent*, Seſſ. 25. which Definition agrees with that of *Florence*, and written, and ſigned by the whole Council, after a moſt exact Diſcuſſion of every term by the Greeks, and is as follows, and no more; *We define that the Holy See Apoſtolique, and the* Roman *Biſhop is Succeſſor of the B.* Peter, *Prince of the Apoſtles, and true Vicar of* Jeſus Chriſt, *and head of the whole Church*; *Father and Doctor of all the Chriſtians*; *and that full power hath been given him by our Saviour* Jeſus Chriſt, *in the perſon of B.* Peter, *to feed, rule, and govern the Univerſal Church, as it is contained in the Acts of Oecumenical Councils, and in the Holy Canons.*

None of theſe three enſuing Doctrines do at all belong to Faith. 1. That the Pope is infallible in himſelf, ſeparated from a General Council.

Council. 2. That he is above a General Council, and may not be judged by it. 3. That he hath an indirect Authority over the temporal power of Kings. The reason is manifest; for none of these are delivered by any clear Divine Revelation; nor proposed by the Universal Church, as appears by what is above cited out of the Councils of *Trent* and *Florence*, where the Grecians were present, who for a long time oppos'd the extent of the Papal power, and did at that time sift every word in the Definition of the Popes power and Authority, before they subscribed thereunto. And also we may well believe, that the Pope and the Western Prelates did not omit to insert what was due to that Authority, and both the one and the other signed no more than what is above mentioned, and agreed, this, and only this to be accepted, as belonging to Faith.

Bellarmin (who to use *du Moulins* Phrase) writes at the Popes feet, and is not wanting to set down all the Rights appertaining to that Soveraign Power, in his Third Controversie, which of the Pope, relates three Opinions currant among Catholicks: 1. That the Pope, as Pope, may be an Heretick, and teach Heresie, if he define without a General Council. Some *Parisian* Doctors, as *Gerson*, *Almanus*, (in their books of the power of the Church) have maintained this Opinion) as also *Alphonsus de Castro*

againſt Hereſies; and *Adrian* the ſixth, Pope, in the Queſtion of Confirmation; who all place the Judgment of *Infallibility*, in matters of Faith, not in the Pope alone, but in the Church; that is the Pope, and a General Council. In the ſame place *Bellarmine* rejects the Opinion that holds the Pope cannot be at all an Heretick, nor publickly teach Hereſie, though he ſhould undertake to define alone. The ſame Author confeſſeth, there are many many things in the *Decretal Epiſtles*, which do not appertain to matter of Faith, but only declare the Opinion of Popes, upon ſuch and ſuch ſubjects, and then, excuſing *Innocentius* the 8th, for giving way to thoſe of *Norway* to celebrate without wine, ſays, It was no decree directed to the whole Church. Hence I gather that *Bellarmin* had little reaſon ſo ſeverely to cenſure the Opinion of the *Pariſians*, as to term it erroneous, and ſomewhat approaching Hereſie, ſince the Proofs which he alleadgeth to make good his cenſure, taken out of the Scriptures, and the Teſtimonies of the holy Fathers, ſpeak abſolutely, and without ſuch Reſtrictions as *Bellarmin* aſſignes. And our profeſſion of Faith goes no farther then thus: *I confeſs and acknowledg all things Defined and declared by the holy General Councils, and particularly, by the Council of Trent*; without any Obligation at all to believe things defined by the Popes, even in Provinicial Councils.

The Opinion therefore of the *Parisians* is not in the least erroneous, nor any whit approaching Heresie, nor opposit the to Council of *Trent*; but remains still probable and acquits us of that great trouble which *Bellarmin* takes upon himself in excusing from error as well the Decrees as Answers of several Popes, which are objected in his third Controversie of the Bishop of *Rome*. *lib. 4. ch. 8, 9, 10, 11, &c.*

As to the second Quere, the same *Bellarmin* (in his fourth Controversie) having put the Question, *Whether the Council be above the Pope?* and shewed, that it began, and was debated during the Councils of *Pisa*, *Constance*, and *Basil*, upon occasion of the great Schism produced by several Pretentions to the Papacy, (a manifest sign that this question was then new) saith, This Question continueth even to this day among Catholicks. And a little farther I find three several *chap. 14.* Opinions of Doctors upon this Subject. The first is, That the Council is above the Pope. Those that favour this Opinion are the *Cardinal* of *Cambray*, *Gerson*, *Almanus*, and some others, besides *Cusanus*, *Panormitanus*, the *Cardinal* of *Florence*, and *Abulensis*: And having first cited their several places, and then explicated them at large, saith; These affirm, the Sovereign power Ecclesiastical is as well in the Council as in the Pope, but in the Coun il

more immediately, and more immoveably: That it is in the Church to rule and order the Pope, insomuch that the Church cannot erre, but the Pope may; that this soveraign power Ecclesiastical is bestow'd upon the Church immediately, and that the Pope being dead, or deposed, or not appearing in Council, the Council is not thereby become an imperfect Body, but perfect, and has still a power to define what is of Faith, and enact Laws, &c. thence they seem to deduce this consequence, *That the Council is above the Pope, and can both judge and punish him, and that it is the same thing to demand whether the Pope be greater than the Council, or whether a part be greater then the whole?* hitherto *Bellarmin.* As to what he seems to say in his 17*th Chap.* that those who adhere to this opinion cannot be excused from great temerity, though they be not properly Hereticques. This censure seems rather guilty of temerity, then the Opinion censur'd, and it is not true which he pretends; That the contrary is taught by the Council of *Florence*, or the last of *Lateran*, for neither of them make any mention of it, and the opinion remains still probable as well by the Authority of the Fathers of *Constance* and *Basil*, as the Ancient Fathers; for certainly it had been needless without this to have assembled so many General Councils. But the Decision of this difficulty is not at all necessary to our design. It is sufficient

for

for me to make it apparent that it is no Article of Faith, nor a Doctrine to which all Christians are bound to submit, since our Doctors are not agreed upon the point, and by application of our *Rule of Faith*, that it is not taught by any General Council.

As for the third Opinion, it is far from being an Article of Faith, to wit, a Doctrine which all Christians are bound to accept, for it is not clearly propos'd by the Universal Church; *Bellarmin* himself (in his Treatise of the Bishop of *Rome*, handling the question of the Popes power *in temporalibus*) affirms, there are three Opinions currant. The first, that the Pope has by Divine right a full power over all the Universe, as well in things Ecclesiastical, as Civil: The second seems to bend to another extremity, and affirms, that the Pope, as Pope, and by Divine right, has no temporal power, and that he can lay no command upon secular Princes, much less deprive them of their Kingdoms and Principalities, though in other respect they might deserve a deprivation. The third Opinion seems to hold a *medium*, and is most frequent among Divines, to wit, That the Pope, as Pope, hath no temporal power directly or immediately, but onely spiritual; That he hath notwithstanding a Soveraign power in tem-

LIBRARY OF THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,

temporalities, yet onely mediate, and in a way to ſpirituality. *Bellarmin* dares not cenſure the ſeccond Opinion as erroneous or near to Hereſie, raſh or improbable, it remains at the leaſt probable; and if ſome Popes have actually deprived ſome Kings and Emperors of their Empires, I anſwer, out of our General Rule of Faith, That the practice of the Univerſal Church in matter of Laws does not conſtitute an Article of Faith, much leſs ſuch ſingular and individual Acts of Popes, which (that they may be freed from blame) it would do well if they could appear grounded upon a probable Opinion.

As to the *Infallibility of the Catholick Church*, our profeſſion of Faith ſpeaks thus; *I receive the holy Scriptures according to that ſence and Expoſition which the Church hath, and doth hold, to which it belongs to judge of the true ſence of the holy Writ.* Theſe words are extracted out of the Council of *Trent*, *Seſſ.* 4. and it is fit we contain our ſelves in theſe terms and go no farther; wherefore as the Council abſtains from this word *Infallibility*, ſpeaking of the Catholick Church, ſo it is beſt to forbear it when we teach what is of Faith; leaving that term to the School-men, as onely fit for them, who know how to uſe it with moderation; for we find it not in the Holy Writ, nor in the Fathers. Let us content our

ourselves with the terms of the Council. The matter thus expreſt is moſt certain, *That the Catholick Church never failes in Faith or Manners, by the undoubted aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, which is promiſed, and never fails; and can never fail, becauſe* Jeſus Chriſt *who hath promiſed it cannot tell a lie.*

Some ſeem to move another Difficulty; whether (ſuppoſing this aſſiſtance) the Holy Ghoſt be infallible in the Church, or the Church becomes *Infallible* by the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt? Let us ſend all theſe Subtilties to the Schools, as alſo this other Queſtion, Whether the Scripture be properly to Judge of Controverſie, or the Church in her General Councils? It is an ordinary ſaying, that the Law judgeth, but experience teacheth, that the Judges perform the buſineſs. God ſpeaking in the Scripture, is no queſtion the ſupreme Judge, but when particular men raiſe debates concerning the ſence of this or that place of Scripture, the Prelates in General Councils muſt determine which is the true ſence of the Propoſition then in debate; Wherefore let us adhere to the words of the Council of *Trent*, and of our Profeſſion of Faith before cited, by which

we

we shall be sufficiently geided, leaving the rest to the decision of the Schools.

There remains now only to take notice what *Blondel* in his great Volume hath said in confirmation both of Rule and profession of Faith upon this Subject of the Popes Supremacy, which he pretends to oppose, and for want of truly understanding the Catholique Doctrine doth notably mistake to our advantage. And first, in his Preface he asketh this Question, *What this Council or Nation eight hundred years since did believe or attribute to the Pope what those of his party now [adays? wither that of* Florence, *nor that of* Trent *hath dared to define any such thing as they pretend to.* It is sufficient for me, that he undertakes to contest matters that are not conteined within the Definitions of General Councils and that he doth ingeniously acknowledge, that the Councils of *Florence* and *Trent* have not defin'd what the Popes party (as he calls them) seems now to contend for, which are undoubtedly the Opinions above mentioned, and by me already separated from the Doctrine of Faith.

A French Minister.

pag. 12.

The Roman See (saith the same Author) *claims to it self Infallibility, and an absolute Monarchial power.* And further,

pag. ib.

ther, The Popes attribute to themselves now a
dges the Title of supreme dominer-
g Authority, and a power erected, p. 830.
ually subduing the members of Christ.

Behold both his apparent mistake, and the
e cause of his separation from the Catho-
ck Church. Yet more positively in ano-
er place he saith, *The Title of the*
postle S. Peter ought not to be que- p. 316.
tioned, since the Greeks and Prote-
tants confess, that it was anciently believed, that
e was President and chief of the Apostles, a
undation of the Church, and Possessor of the
eys of the Kingdom of Heaven.
nd again, *Rome, as the Church* page 107.
nsecrated by the abode and Mar-
rdome of St. Peter, whom Antiquity hath ac-
knowledged chief of the Apostolique Colledge,
aving been honoured with the Title of St. Pe-
r's Seat; may without any difficulty be confi-
rmed even by one of the most renown'd Gene-
al Councils, to wit, *that of* Calcedon, *as the*
ead. Herein he clearly acknowledges St.
ETER, to be head of the Apostles,
ad of the Church, by Divine Right, and
e Bishop of *Rome* his Successor, of which
have heretofore treated, in answer to his
reat Volumn, or rather produced it as use-
l to our cause, wherein he both proves our
ract learnedly, and confutes the 30th Ar-

ticle of his own Profeſſion of Faith, where it is ſaid, *We believe all true Paſtors in what place ſoever they are, to have equal Authority, under one chief and univerſal Biſhop* Jeſus Chriſt.

As to the difficulty moved, concerning a Judge, *du Moulin* (in his Treatiſe of the Judge of Controverſies) thinks it convenient, that particular men ſhould ſubmit to Councils and Synods, nay even to National Councils. And moreover, it is prohibited to the Paſtors of Churches, to teach anything oppoſite to that which is concluded in the National Synods. To this they are led by the ordinary courſe of reaſon; For otherwiſe (as they confeſs themſelves) there can be neither Peace nor Order in the Church, but a moſt certain and ruinous confuſion. *Daillé* accords more diſtinctly with this Doctrine, in his *Uſe of the holy Fathers*, and ſaies, in the end we muſt refer our ſelves to the Church, provided we know which is the true Church, to whom this reference is due, and if ones aſſurance be reſolved into the inward perſwaſion of the Holy Ghoſt, which gives a diſcernment of the true from the falſe, who does not ſee, that we both may and ought to believe, that the Holy Ghoſt more powerfully aſſiſts the body of the Church, than particular perſons.

p. 355.

p. 280.

It

It is certain therefore, both a ready way to an accord, and to prevail with our Separa-tists, if we ſtand faſt to the forementioned terms of our Profeſſion of Faith, and the Council of *Trent*, without adding, diminiſhing, or altering: In which no uſe is made of this word *Infallibility*. And if we ſeparately tie the Doctrine of Faith contained in theſe terms, from all other opinions, we ſhall eaſily convince thoſe that are now out of the way, to ſubmit to our Profeſſion of Faith, and the Council of *Trent*, which is abundantly ſufficient to make them perfect Catholiques.

CHAP. V.

Of the EUCHARIST.

OUr Profession of Faith according to the Council of *Trent* goes thus, *I confess, that in the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar there is truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, as also the Soul and Divinity of our Saviour* Jesus Christ, *and that there is made a mutation of all the substance of bread into the body, and of all the substance of wine into blood, which mutation the Catholique Church calls Transubstantiation.* This is an Article of Faith, and let us be sure to understand it according to the Exposition of the same Council in the same Chap. *The holy Synod doth profess, that* Jesus Christ, *true God, and true Man, is contain'd in the Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist, after the consecration of bread and wine, truly, really, and substantially, under the species of the sensible things; for these things are not repugnant in themselves, that the same Saviour be always sitting at the right hand of his Father, in heaven, according to his natural way of existence, and yet his substance be present sacramentally in many other places, according to another way of existence; which though we can hardly express by words, yet we may conceive in thought, enlight-*

and by Faith, *that it is not impossible to God*; *and this we are bound constantly to believe.* And further, in the second Chapter, our Saviour will have it, that this Sacrament be received as the spiritual food of our soules, by which they must be nourished, and comforted, living by the life of him that hath said, *who eateth me, shall live for me*: And as an antidote and defence by which we may be delivered from daily faults, and preserved from mortal sins, we may also say, that *Jesus Christ*, according to his manner of being in the Sacrament, is as a Spirit, and that he is there spiritually, that is, according to the nature of a Spirit, *John* 6. 63. *The words that I speak to you are spirit and life*, without being seen, without extention of parts, whole in every part of the Symbols; neither thick, nor big, as to the occupation of place, for spirits in their substances are thus truly said to be in places. In fine, That the body of *Jesus Christ* is here spiritual and not sensual; since St. *Paul* avers the same of our bodies, after the Resurrection; *It is sown a sensual body, it will rise a spiritual*, 1 Cor. 15. 44. to wit, (according to the Gloss of *Geneva*) in quality, which shall be quite different, and yet the substance of the body not to perish. And a little after, *The Later Adam*, which is Jesus Christ, *hath been made into a quickning spirit*: Let us add,

to-

towards the leſſening of this Controverſie, what we finde ſet down in the 36th Article of our Separatiſts Confeſſion of Faith: *Jeſus Chriſt doth truly feed and nouriſh us with his fleſh and bloud: Moreover, we believe, that by the ſecret and incomprehenſible virtue of his Spirit, he doth nouriſh and give us both life with his body and his bloud.* What difficulty then remains, in caſe they believe the ſubſtance of the body to be preſent for the nouriſhment of their Soules, to believe alſo, that the ſame ſubſtance is preſent under the ſymbols of bread? for what they object doth equally oppoſe the one and the other; in fine, (they being united with the *Lutherans*, who profeſs to believe this preſence) why will they differ with us upon the ſame Motive?

We ought not at all to enter into the debate of School-queſtions, nor determine univerſally or definitively, whether the only body of *Chriſt*, according to his natural exiſtence, may be in ſeveral places? or, whether no other body but only the body of Chriſt may have a Sacramental exiſtence, or be a Sacrament? and, whether from hence it follows, that it is the body of God? The main and convincing Reaſon is, that the Divine Revelation teaches not, nor the Univerſal Church propoſeth any of theſe to be believed: And it imports not, that ſome of our

Doctors

Doctors seem to conclude these from Divine Revelation, or, from the proposal of the Church; for what seems to follow from either, is neither Divine Revelation, nor the Proposal of the Church, and consequently (according to the general opinion of Divines) no Article of Faith, to which only we are bound to submit. And for the same reason we ought to be silent in these Questions of *Vasquez*, and other Schoolmen; as Whether the same body may be in many places at the same time? or, Whether Christ be in the Sacrament, as in a place? or, Whether being there, he may neither be seen, nor suffer, nor act, *&c.*

As for *Transubstantiation* it self, and that we believe the bread is changed, converted, and transubstantiated into the body of *Jesus Christ*, it is not (as *Vasques* noteth very accutely, and proves at large) That the matter of bread begins to be under the form of the body of Christ, as the meat is said to be converted into the substance of what is nourished. Far be it from us to admit any of these convertions; and yet our Separatists are often perswaded by their Preachers, that this is our Tenet, which we abhor, for so the body of Jesus Christ should be nourished by bread, and consequently become corruptible, and both grow and diminish, which is repug-

nant

nant to his immortality. It is not also (as the same Author observes) that in the body of Christ is produced some accidental quality, or some substantial manner, which is incompatible with the substance of bread and wine; yet as a formal cause repugnant, by which bread and wine give over their being or desist to be. Nor, according to the same Author, that the body of *Jesus Christ* is produced and conserved in the Sacrament by virtue of the words. In fine (sayes the same Auhor) This *Transubstantiation* is neither a change nor a production of any thing, but it is a relation of order betwixt the substance that doth desist to be; to wit, the Bread and Wine, and that into which it doth desist, or succeeds to it, namely, the body and bloud of *Jesus Christ*; or rather (according to the same Author) the Church doth not properly fix her definition; but only such is the force and efficacy of the words, by reason of their signification, that they cause the body and bloud of Christ to be present, and by that destroy the substance of bread and wine. And again, such is the signification of the words of consecration. *This is my body*, &c. That by virtue and signification of the said words, not only the body and bloud of *Christ* is made present under the *species*, but also the substance of bread and wine give over their being; for the words being

being instituted by Christ, and pronounced in his name, and by his Authority, ought to be absolutely true: but they cannot be true, if they do not render the body and bloud of Christ present under the Species, and destroy the being of bread and wine: and the Incompossibility of the body and bloud with the substance of the bread and wine proceeds from the sole verity of the words; for they cannot be truly utter'd, except the presence be made good of the body and bloud, and the bread and wine destroy'd: Hitherto *Vasques*.

What difficulty is there at all, both to conceive and submit to this Catholique verity, so plainly expounded, and not to boggle at *Transubstantiation* in so clear a sence, it being most conformable to reason, to believe that God will make good his own words? The difficulty seems to consist in this, that some expect an alteration, or a change in a natural way, and are willing to understand those words in a different sense from that of the Church, as if our Questions concerning faith depended upon mere words, which God forbid. And therefore let us not meddle at all with these Questions moved by the School-men concerning the essence of *Transubstantiation*, to wit, Whether the body of Christ may be made present in the blessed

Sacrament, without a conversion? and whether every thing may be changed into another? These *Queries* seem rather to cast a mist before our eyes, than at all to clear the difficulty.

The National Synod of Ministers held at *Charenton* in the year 1631. and *Daille* with his Colleagues have made a fair overture for an agreement in this Question: *Daille* (in his Apology for the decree of that Synod, declaring their union with the *Lutherans*, who affirm, that the body of our Saviour is truly present in the bread of the Eucharist) saith, This opinion hath no venome in it, nor is prejudicial to Piety, or their salvation: And for these reasons, the Churches of this Kingdom in their National Synod, at *Charenton*, in the year 1631. by an expres Act, have received the said *Lutherans* to Communion and Table, notwithstanding this opinion particular to them and not held by us. To this I will add a Letter of the same Author to one

P. 72. *Monsieur Monglat*. It is a very hard thing, in my opinion, to make that man pass either for a good Christian, a tolerable Citizen, or a person of sound reason, that believing he may work his Salvation in the Roman Church, will live out of their Communion, or not be-

lieve

lieve as she doth. From these Premises I conclude, they are bound to believe the body of our Saviour is truly present in the Symbole of the Eucharist, under pain of being neither esteemed good Christians, tolerable Citizens, or men of sound reason: and, this being admitted, they ought also to believe (under the same penalty) *Transubstantiation*, according as we have explicated it, there being nothing to be added, but the absence of bread, a doctrine in it self of no venome, nor any wayes prejudicial to Salvation. Is not this a fair and easie way to an Agreement; which our Adversaries cannot reject, without hazarding so great a Censure of so great a man among them,

as Daille

CHAP. VI.

Of the SACRIFICE of the MASSE.

OUr above mentioned Profession of Faith, extracted from the Council of *Trent* hath these words, *I do confess that in the Masse there is offered* Sess. 22. c. 1, 2, 3. *to God, a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice for the living and for the dead.* This is an Article of Faith, and there are also Scholastical and Problematical Questions upon the same Subject; as Whether this Sacrifice be absolute in it self or only commemorative of that upon the Cross? These are the terms of *Vasquez*: *That the action of Consecration is in the respect only a Sacrifice, or an action of Offering; that, by the body and bloud of* Jesus Christ *consecrated and really there contained, is represented the bloudy Sacrifice of him that was offered upon the Cross.* I do not say, these words, or this explication is of Faith, but I dare affirm, that to be a Catholique, it is sufficient to believe a proper Sacrifice, whether it be absolute or commemorative; and what difficulty do our Adversaries finde in admitting such a Sacrifice, relative or commemorative? T

The fame *Vasques* teacheth thus; *The reason of the Sacrifice consists formally in the signification of the omnipotency of God, Author of life and death.* cap. 8. And again, *All the Essence of the Sacrifice consists in the signification of the death of Christ, which was a bloudy Sacrifice, and for that reason is represented, not by the consecration of one onely Species, but of both together.* cap. 5. For this reason, I say, the true and entire essence of this Sacrifice consists in the Consecration, not of one onely, but of both *Species*. Yet an absolute Sacrifice (to wit, not commemorative of another) requires some change of the thing offer'd; And yet this change is not the formal reason of the Sacrifice, for that consists in the signification of the omnipotency of God, Author of life and death. And therefore, if there be found an Oblation, by which without a true and real change of the thing offer'd, God may be acknowledg'd and honour'd as Author of life and death, it ought truly and properly to be termed a Sacrifice; But such is the consecration of the body and bloud of Christ, without a real change of Christ himself, by reason of the only representation of his death; this therefore shall truly and properly be a Sacrifice: And it is manifest, that by the only repre-

epresentation of the death of *Christ* in the consecration is as well signified, that God is the Author of life and death, as by the bloody death of Christ upon the Cross; And according to this we have said heretofore, that there is not required to the Essence of a Sacrifice in general, any change of the thing offer'd; for the commemorative Sacrifice may have a being without it, though it be necessary for the essence of an absolute Sacrifice; because, The formal reason of a Sacrifice, which consists in signification, not by words, but by the things themselves, by which God is signified Author of life and death, is found in the commemorative Sacrifice without any such change.

But we must note, that it would not be sufficient for a commemorative Sacrifice to be truly and properly termed a Sacrifice, if it were only a simple sign of the death of any thing, not containing the thing it self, whose death is represented; for by that means the thing it self whose death is represented, should not be said to be offer'd in Sacrifice, nor be truly a commemorative Sacrifice, but rather a sign or bare token of a Sacrifice; But it is necessarily requir'd, that the thing it self, whose death is represented, be a sign of its own death. Since then *Christ* himself is under the *species* of

bread

bread and wine, and the action of the Priest in offering them, doth so much concern him, that he himself, being represented by the *species* of bread and wine, doth represent in a particular manner (according to which he is consecrated by the Priest) the bloody and real death of himself, and that by this representation he declares, that God is the Author of life and death: Though he be not said to be kill'd and dye truly and in effect, but in figure and resemblance only, notwithstanding he is said to be truly offer'd in Sacrifice, and immolated in effect; what difficulty is there in admitting a commemorative Sacrifice in this sence?

As to this word, *propitiatory Sacrifice*, it is an Article of Faith, as I said before, but not that it is propitiatory as the Sacrifice of the Cross, or the Redemption of humane kind; for the Merit of the Sacrifice of the Cross (according to the same *Vasquez*) was of an infinite value more then sufficient for our Redemption, and therefore there is no necessity of any other immolation or Sacrifice, or of a reiteration of the same, either in the same manner or any other, whereby *Christ* should merit the grace of our Redemption: And St. *Paul* (*Heb.*

disp. 221. *chap.* 4.

(*Heb.* 9. 10.) speaks in the same sence; for in this unbloody Sacrifice *Christ* doth not merit, but his will was, that as well by this as by the Sacrament, the fruit of his universal Merit might be applyed to us. Conformable to which the *Sess.* 22. c. 1. Council of *Trent* teaches, that Christ hath left in his Church this Sacrifice, that the bloody one which was once performed upon the Cross may be represented, and the Soveraign vertue thereof applyed to the remission of those sins we daily commit. Here it is defin'd, that the Sacrifice is a particular means whereby to apply the fruit and merit of the passion of *Christ*. And what *Calvin* sayes, that it is superfluous for the application of the fruit of the Cross, since there are divers other wayes by which it may be applyed, is a most frivolous Objection; for by the same reason he may prove, that Baptism, and their Communion (as they celebrate it) are superfluous, since there are other means by which the merit of the passion of *Christ* may be applyed, as by the Preaching of the Word, *&c.*

But I wonder what prejudice the Church receives by various applications of that merit? The same *Vasq.* *disp.* 128. *cap.* 1. (having cited the Opinions of some

some Authors, who say, That not only the venial, but mortal sins for whom this Sacrifice is offer'd are blotted out thereby, or by the Sacrament of *Penance*; meaning that it is sufficient for that effect, that he for whom it is offer'd have only *Attrition*, and that by the efficacy of this Sacrifice, as well as the Sacrament of Penance, the grace of Remission of sins is immediately conferr'd, without any other affection of the will) confutes these Opinions, and proves (in his 2*d*. and 3*d*. *Chap*.) That this Sacrifice hath no force at all for the remitting of mortal sins, nor even of venial, nor so much as to augment grace and Justification, as is perform'd by the Sacrament of Penance; but only to implore the help of Grace, and the spirit of Repentance and *Contrition*, by which our sins are truly forgiven, or to procure such holy inclinations by which a man may augment his Justification; Insomuch that this Sacrifice of the Mass is in some sort less propitiatory than the Sacraments, and less than *Contrition*, since by the one and the other immediately sins are forgiven.

Moreover *Vasquez* teacheth and proves at large, that *Contrition* alone purgeth from mortal sin, and consequently, that it is of it self propitiatory, and in that regard

much more *formally*, than this our Sacrifice, which is propitiatory only by way of impetration. In the same manner are also Acts of Faith and Prayer propitiatory; And therefore I wonder where the difficulty lyes in receiving this our Sacrifice of the Mass as propitiatory, since the same is attributed to acts of Faith, acts of Contrition, and receiving the Blessed Sacrament. Insomuch that I conclude (the misunderstanding of the Question being removed) the way to an accord is very easie.

CHA

CHAP. VII.

Of the ADORATION *of the Eucharist.*

THe Council of *Trent* runs thus; *If any one saies, that* Jesus Christ, *the only Son of God, ought not to be adored with the exterior worship of* Latria *in the Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist, and for that reason, that it ought not to be publickly expos'd to the people to be adored, and that they who do adore it are Idolaters, Anathema.* This is therefore an Article or Faith according to our Rule, since it is propos'd by the Universal Church, and it is sufficient to be a Catholick in this point, to receive it in this sence only, according to the farther explanation of the foresaid Council, *chap.* 5. And as we honour a man apparel'd, without requiring him to put off his cloathes, even in the same manner as if he were not vested: So we adore *Jesus Christ* under the Symbols or signes, as if he were not vested in them, and it is one and the same honour, not two sorts of Adoration which sometimes we call the Adoration of Christ, and the Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament; for by the Blessed Sacrament the Council *Sess.* 13. can. 11.

underſtands *Jeſus Chriſt* thus veſted, and under theſe ſignes, and the Adoration of the B. Sacrament, the Adoration of *Jeſus Chriſt* in this veſture. This is moſt evident, for it adds, that the worſhip of *Latria* (which is due to God alone) is given to this B. Sacrament, and every man knows this manner of worſhip is due to none but God, whatſoever may belong to the relative *in abſtracto*; of which more hereafter.

On the contrary, it is not a point of Faith, that the reverence we give to the Symbols or ſignes is *Latria*, but rather ſome inferiour worſhip; as when we kiſs the garment of ſome perſon of quality, yet it is a hard matter even for a Courtier punctually to define what that Reverence is, though our Separatiſts will needs engage us in this tickle Queſtion. There is no Catholick (ſaies *Bellarmin* upon this ſubject) teacheth of themſelves to be adored with the worſhip *Latria*, but only reverenced by ſome inferiour worſhip which is agreeable to all the Sacraments. The Miniſters themſelves, in their book of Diſcipline, give order that men be uncovered during the celebration of the Sacraments. There are ſeveral Opinions (ſaies *Vaſques*) concern-

1.4.c.29.

ch.10.art.2.

Reverence due to the *spe-*
of the B. Sacrament; 3.p.*disp.*108.
me say the *species* may be chap.12.
nour'd in themselves by a
roper worship, as many hold concerning
ctures, and the name of *Jesus*, but I find
le weight in this Opinion, because the
ramental *species* are inanimated things,
d of themselves incapable of honour and
verence, except in the quality of being
n'd with Christ, and containing him;
erefore *Cajetan* saies very well, That in
e Blessed Sacrament we adore not the acci-
nts at all, but *Christ* contained in them,
d that the Adoration, which tends to
hrist, determines only by accident in the
ies.

Hence will appear how unjustly the
nch Ministers (in their Apology for the
ion made in their National Synod held at
aemon the year 1631. with the *Lutherans*)
ject (as the chief cause of their separation)
e Adoration of the Eucharist, believed and
ctised in the Church of *Rome*. I intend
e to confute *Daillé* out of *Daillé* him-
lf.

There is a large difference (saies he in his
tter to *Monsieur Monglat*, pag. 6. explica-
g the 9th *chap.* of their Apology) *betwixt*
se two Adorations, the first, That we ought

to

to adore the body of Christ in the Eucharist: a
2d, That we ought to adore the Eucharist it
The later is directed to a certain object sub
ing in the place where it is, to wit, to the
stance vail'd with the accidents of bread
wine, insomuch as presupposing that sub
to be a creature, the adoration we give
of necessity be an unlawful duty forbidden
God, though the former seems only vain
unprofitable, and falls of it self to nothing,
abuse consisting in this: Not that the adora
made to an object, which is not adorable a
the other, but in this only, that by error
mistake it is sought and thought to be where
not: Hitherto *Daillé* This latter Adorat
(as the pretended principal cause of th
separation rather from us than the *L*
vans) is falsly imputed to us, and will
pear a meer calumny. But the import
of the matter being great, and becau
is assigned as the foundation of their sep
tion particularly from the *Roman* Catho
prevailed with me to address my self to
Doctors of the faculty of Divinity in the
niversity of *Paris*, requesting an answ
the case thus stated.

The Doctors are humbly desired to
ver their Opinion, whether the fact co
ed in the 36th Page of *Monsieur Daill*
Letter to Mr. *Menglat* be true or false.

The Doctors (whose names are under-
ritten) of the faculty of Divinity in the U-
versity of *Paris*, answer; *That the fact is*
lse, and falsly imposed upon the Catholique
hurch; which (adoring the holy Eucharist)
s not believe any other substance vail'd under
e accidents of bread and wine to be ador'd but
sus Christ; *anathematizing all those that a-*
re any other substance whatsoever. And it is
s falsly suppos'd by the Author, that there is
re danger in the Adoration of the Catholick,
an of the Lutheran, because the Catholick
dreseth his Adoration to an object that is not
orable, and by that means his worship becomes
lawful and forbiden by God. It being most
doubtedly true, that the object which the Ca-
lick adores is Jesus Christ, *adoreable where-*
ever he is. And thus in the Eucharist (in
ich the Catholick Church acknowledges no o-
er substance after the Consecration but that of
Christ) is only adored, and nothing else to be a-
red. And though by inconsideration or any other
ccident, instead of the Eucharist, an unconsecra-
d bread should be expos'd to the people, the Ca-
lick neither believes any Adoration due, nor
tends any Adoration to it, but only to the sub-
ance of Jesus Christ.

Apr. 18. 1643. Signed in the Original, *Jaques Hennequin; Emmerez; Perrerot; Du Prefet de Mincé; Capelus; M. Cantut; Brousse; Judas; A. de Mauly.*

In

In fine (to cut the Question short) the Council of *Trent* obliges us no farther, than to adore *Jesus Christ* in the Eucharist; therefore our adoration cannot be in it self unjust, nor a just cause to *Daille* of separation, which in the said Apology goes on, saying, *That the Church of* Rome *commands all those of her communion to render that soveraign worship which she calls* Latria, *and which she confesses due to God alone, to the bread of the Eucharist (But in the Eucharist there is no substance of bread, but of* Jesus Christ *himself, according to St.* John 6. 51.) *since they hold this Sacrament for their great God: (understanding always* Jesus Christ *under these Symbols or signs) for he is there hidden and in mystery, according to the Greek word, which is in Latin* Sacramentum. *And as Christ in himself is termed a Sacrament, so we say, the Sacrament of the Incarnation, for Christ incarnate, and in the same manner the Sacrament of the Eucharist,* Jesus Christ *being really in the Eucharist.* And therefore in this sence and no other, according to the Council of *Trent*, we adore with absolute *Latria*, due to God alone this most holy Sacrament.

Here is no news among us of two Adorations, nor any difference concerning the Adorations which *Daille* seems to fancy; The first, Of adoring the body of Christ in the

Euch-

Eucharist; the other, of adoring the Eucharist it self: They are not, according to our Principles, two, but one and the same signified in divers terms, as the Incarnation, and Sacrament of the Incarnation are not different, but only in the variety of expression: wherefore *Daille* is much mistaken in the whole business, as well
in citing thus the Council *Sess.* 13. *c.* 5. *of Trent*. The Church of *Rome* *pag.* 66. will that we give the Eucharist
an Adoration, not mediate, but immediate; not relative, but absolute. These things he repeats very often, as also his own mistakes of our Doctrine, which compose the principal and greatest part of his Apology; for, besides that the Council of *Trent* is free from this imputation, there is not any Doctor teaches, that *Latria* ought to be given to the *species* of the Sacrament, but to *Jesus Christ* himself, the other being an Idolatry beyond that of the Pagans. In fine, he fights with his own shadow; and I willingly admit of all his Arguments from the 8th to the 18th Chapter, against such Adorations as are only grounded upon his own mistakes. What quality and manner of worship belongs to the *species*, relative, secondary, *&c.* our School-men have decided their opinions. Wherefore we consider

them only as Problematical Questions, and not belonging to Faith; since the Council is silent in them, and consequently they can give no just cause of Separation.

Daille confesseth in his Trea- tise of *Images*, that there is a pag. 376. 340. degree of respect and honour due to the Instruments of Religion; as *Chalices*, the sacred Books, the water of Baptism, the bread and wine of the *Cene*, &c. And therefore we shall press him no farther, nor require any other worship to the Species of the Sacrament, but what he willingly grants; and only put him in minde of what he sayes in the same Apology: *If the subject, which they name the Sacrament of the Eucharist, be in its substance the body of Christ, (as they of the Roman Church hold) it is evident, they may and ought to adore it, it being most certain, that the body of Christ is a subject adorable.*

I conclude therefore, that the forementioned Objection of *Daille* being of no weight at all, can afford no just cause of Separation, and consequently, that the difficulty concerning Adoration is at an end, and ought both to be believed and practised under pain of being esteemed neither good Christians, tolerable Citizens, nor even of sound reason.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the HONOUR *due to Saints.*

I BELIEVE, THAT THE SAINTS, WHICH REIGN IN HEAVEN WITH CHRIST, ARE TO BE VENERATED: These are the words of our Profession of Faith; and the same is taught by the Council of *Trent*, and consequently is an Article of Faith, which ought not to be controverted, for if we honour Saints upon earth, which are the faithfull, why should not we honour those who are endowed with a sanctity more sublime and certain than the others?

But it is not of Faith that the honour we give our B. Lady, or the Angels, &c. is a *Religious* honour, for the Church doth not determine it, and our Doctors are of different Opinions, which *Vasquez* argues at large 3. p. *disp.* 98. The first Opinion is, (saith he) That it is one and the same vertue in fact, *Latria*, due to God alone; and *Dulia* to the Saints; but the more probable opinion is, that *Dulia* is a distinct vertue from *Latria*, by which we honour the Saints, and that Religion and *Latria* being the same

thing, belong to the worship of God alone. These say, the Veneration of Saints appertains to another vertue, and that it is not properly an act of Religion, but a vertue by which honour is given to Saints, and to persons in an eminent civil dignity.

The Doctors are not well agreed in this point. S. *Bonaventure* with some others distinguishes the vertue of *Dulia* from that of *Latria*, and does not subdivide *Dulia*, but leaves it indifferent as well to persons of authority as to Saints; and, interposing his own opinion, sayes, We may well affirm that is one and the same vertue, whatsoever we call it, whether *Observance* or *Dulia*, by which we pay the honour due to Eminent persons, and such as are constituted in Dignity, as Dukes, Governours, Senators, Priests, and Saints. For since the cause of the Reverence we give is Excellency or Dignity created, there can be no diversity of causes for the practice of the vertue: yet I easily assent, that there is a special habit of vertue, by which we honour Saints, and Priests, by reason the Dignity, moving us to worship or Reverence them, is of a superiour nature to that of a civil respect.

Let us call this honour due to Saints civil, or Religious, as they please, since to be a Catholique it is sufficient that we honour

our those in heaven upon an equal title
with the Saints on earth, and Priests. Who
is it then that can condemn this honour? It
must needs be a mistake, or misunderstand-
ing of our Doctrine, that gives our Separa-
tists this pretence of difference. The Coun-
cil of *Trent* giving no particular name to this
honour, leaves us at liberty to call it what
we please; and I cannot conclude better
than with the saying of *Drelincourt*, a Minis-
ter of *France*, as well in his later Treatise of
the quality of the honour given by them to
the Mother of God, as in his answer to
Hautin the Jesuit; These are his words:
*Having my intention wholly bent upon the peace
and concord among Christians, I have endea-
voured to reconcile, with a spirit of sweetness
and Charity, the difference that is betwixt us
and those of the* Roman *Church, concerning
the honour which is due to the holy and blessed
Virgin* Mary, *and that it may appear, we are
not persons that oblige our selves scrupulously
to words, I have made no difficulty to avow,
that the honour due to her may in some manner
be termed a religious honour.*

Thus you see in this Point our Separatists
are inclined to teach as much or more than
is rigour is required at their hands.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

Of the INVOCATION *of* SAINTS.

OUr Profession of Faith teaches this, I HOLD CONSTANTLY, THAT THE SAINTS, WHO REIGN WITH HEAVEN WITH JESUS CHRIST ARE TO BE INVOCATED: Words extracted out of the Council of *Sess. 25. Trent*, which explicates this more at large in these terms following: *It is good and profitable to call upon the Saints, and to have recourse to their Prayers, aid, and assistance, whereby to obtain from God many benefits, by the merits of his Son* Jesus Christ, *who is our Redeemer and Saviour.* This is an Article of Faith, and the Church proposeth it to our belief.

Though it is most certain, that the Canonized Saints (which we call upon) are Saints, since the Church assisted by the Holy Ghost (after a diligent and exact enquiry of their lives and miracles, done well during their abode in this world, and after their death) proposeth them to us as such; yet our *Rule of Faith* which we constantly adhere to, doth not deliver for an Article

icle of Faith, that the Cannoniz'd Saints
orbi gratia) St. *Francis*, St. *Basil*, &c.
Saints, or even the Apostles themselves;
nothing is of Faith, but what God has
ealed to the Prophets and Apostles, pro-
ed by the Universal Church: But God
not reveal'd to them that St. *Francis*,
example, liv'd saintly, wrought mira-
, is in heaven, no not so much as that he
was in the world; It is therefore no
icle of Faith; and besides, it depends
n Questions of Fact, and of those Infor-
ions and Testimonies that are taken be-
the Cannonization, which is far from
g a Revelation made to the Prophets
Apostles, &c. and in which the Church
y be mis-led by false Informations, as I
ed before out of *Bellarmine* and other
ctors. And to this I adde, that these
nonizations are only performed by the
e, and those entrusted by him, and that
whole Church, neither in the Council of
, nor any other General Council, hath
pos'd or taught that St. *Francis* liv'd
y, and is now in heaven. The thing of
lf is most certain, as supported by the
t solid and undoubted Proofs imagina-
; and that person justly to be censur'd
o should call it in question; yet is it de-
nstrable by our Principles to be no Arti-
of Faith.

It

It is a matter very considerable, that the Council of *Trent* (one of the most learned that ever was in the Church, and where appeared a very great number of most Eminent Divines, as well School-men as others) should propose positively unto us, *That it is good and profitable, humbly to call upon the Saints, and to have recourse to their intercession*, and yet not to propose unto us, that they hear our Prayers. If the Council had deem'd it an Article of Faith, why did it not teach it, as well as define, *That it is good and profitable to call upon them?* In the latter, the Council is silent, contenting itself with the former Definition. And therefore when we go about to reclaim those that are out of the way, we ought also to be silent in this point. But since from hence in express terms we cannot discover it to be of Faith, we may conclude strongly from the silence of this learned Council, that it is not of obligation to be believed. It seems truly to follow from the Invocation which the Church hath always believed, and practised towards Saints raigning with Jesus *Christ*, and that see him face to face (as we shall explicate more at large hereafter). But, as many of our Doctors are of opinion that what follows from Scripture is not an Article of Faith, because not expressly re-

; ſo, that which follows from the pro-
ſal of the Church, is not the expreſſe pro-
ſal of the Church, and conſequently no
ticle of Faith; that is, to which every one
bound to ſubſcribe under pain of Here-
.

Bellarmin affirms this conſe-
ence to be good: *The Saints Tom. 1 con.*
juſtly call'd upon, therefore lib. 1. ch. 2.
know what we demand; and
ey are not called upon in vain; and
ough we ſhould grant they do not hear
r Prayers, yet it is ſupplyed by ſome o-
er way. For as we do not in vain preſent
r requeſts to the King, though we know
does not read them; as for example, in
e Minority of Kings, yet Petitions are ad-
reſt unto him, and who dare blame the
actice? yet ſome others appointed for
at ſervice do perform it, and the Petition-
s obtain their Requeſts, as if the King
mſelf had perus'd them. Certainly St.
ſtin (in his Book *De cura pro mortuis*, ca.
6. ſpeaks thus doubtfully: *This Queſtion*
exceeds the reach of my judgment, How the
Martyrs relieve thoſe who are certainly aſſiſt-
ed by them? whether they are preſent by them-
ves at the ſame time in ſo many ſeveral places
ere the benefit of their ſuccour is received?
being retired from the converſation of men

in some place proportionated to their merits, and there interceding for the relief of those that call upon them, as we pray for the dead who are not really present with them, and know not what they are, nor what they do; God Omnipotent and ever present, hearing the Prayers of the Martyrs, grants to men by the Ministry of Angels those helps which are suitable to the merits of the Martyrs, where he will, when he will, and as he pleaseth, This is too high and hidden for me to define: But *Bellarmin* adds very well, *Although we may doubt in what manner the Saints and Angels know things present, and our Prayers; yet it is certain that they know them, in that they are over us, and have care of our affairs; and it belongs to their supreme beatitude to know the things that concern them, and principally such as belong to their honour and glory.*

Do not the Devils appear and assist Witches and Sorcerers when they are call'd upon, and will our Seperatists deny the like to the Saints? Let them also deny it to the humanity of *Jesus Christ* in heaven, and demand with *Calvin*, whether it hath ears long enough to reach so far, and eyes so sharp sighted as to view our necessities? For, in the same manner, as that holy soul of *Jesus Christ* hears our Prayers in heaven; so do the Saints, seeing the Divinity face to face.

which all things are contain'd; since in
holy Inheritance (as St. *Gregory* calls
) all see God by a common light: And
ho can be ignorant of any thing, who
nows him that knows all? This is an easie
y to conceive how the soul of *Jesus Christ*,
d the Saints both see and know, in God,
r Prayers. As to what St. *Austin* and
me others have doubted, or rather (ac-
ding to *Suarez*) thought that the Saints
d those other souls sufficiently purged,
ere not so soon received into beatitude,
t were even to the day of Judgment con-
'd to some place, where they did not en-
y the beatifical Vision: It is no wonder
all that the same St. *Austin* doubted whe-
er the Saints deceased heard our prayers:
ut the Church, in the Council of *Florence*,
ath taught in her Definition, *That the souls of the dead, as soon as cleansed from all sin, are received into heaven, and see clearly God, as he is in himself.*

This being supposed, which imports that what is said in St. *Mat.* 22. *v.* 30. is from that time verified of them, *They are the Angels of God in heaven*: and it seems to me, that this hearing of our Prayers is very clear in Scripture, and particularly in St. *Matth.* 18. 10. *See you despise not one of these little ones, for I say unto you, their Angels in hea-*

ven alwaies see the face of my Father which is in heaven. And St. *Luke* 15. 7. *There shall be joy in heaven upon the sinner that doth penance.* The Saints therefore hear our prayers, as the Angels see the contempt of [illegible] of those little ones, or as those in heaven [illegible] the Repentance of a sinner. What difficulty is there at all, that a Spirit should hear and know, as Spirits hear and know? For in the face of God all is clearly seen and known, as St. *Gregory* witnesseth. And if the soul of *Jesus Christ* contemplates all things relate unto it, that is, all things in general, so do the Saints that which concerns them, as in particular the Prayers that are addressed unto them: For confirmation of this truth many Testimonies of the Fathers may be alledged, which shall be hereafter performed, and the consent of Authors, since the Definition of the Council of *Florence*. And notwithstanding all this, I do not infer, that this consequence is necessary, *They are to be invoked, therefore they hear our* Prayers. St. *Austin* and others held the one, and yet doubted of the other; but supposing they see God face to face, the difficulty is not great, and the Consequence from the Invocation of Saints to this, That they hear our Prayers, is easily maintainable in this sense wherein I deliver it: From the

Pre-

emises ensues a fair way to an Agreement; the modern Separatists, or at least most them hold, That the Saints are happy in eaven, and see God face to face, before Resurrection, and are willing to perude themselves, that from hence they go ectly to heaven, and en- a perfect felicity. *Du* *Bucler* of Faith and Evasions.
lin sayes, We tend to Beatitude of the Saints that are in glory, it is false that we believe the Angels and ints ignorant of our Necessities. Though ir Father *Calvin* taught them such Doctrine in his *Instituti-* lib. 1. c. 25. Sect. 6.
, writing thus; *Many trouble* *selves disputing in what place souls are de-* *ed, or whether they already enjoy the glory* *ised for ever. It is a folly and temerity to* *ire after these unknown and high Mysteries* *ch God hath not imparted to us.* And a lit- after, *The souls of the Faithful having end-* *their term of combate and work, are received* *rest, where they expect the fruition of Glory* *ised, and so all things remain in suspence* *il the coming of our Saviour JESUS* *HRIST.*

Tis true, our Separatists change their octrine as they please, but the latter Opi- on, *That the Saints, and Faithful see God* *e to face*, is now currant, and will some-

what

what facilitate this point, That the Saints in heaven hear our Prayers. And though they should not assent to this, they ought not to reject what the Council of *Trent* proposeth, *That it is good and profitable, humbly to call upon the Saints, and have recourse to their Intercession*; For St. *Austin*, and the other Fathers have called upon them though doubting whether they heard them or no? And I dare affirm, our Separatists neither out of Scripture, nor by any other sufficient proof can shew, that in case they do not hear us, that yet it is not good and profitable to have recourse to them; for the contrary is apparent by what I said before, and by the example of the Kings of Norority, where we both render him the honour that is due, and obtain our requests. The same is evident in the Invocation of Saints. And therefore I wonder what should hinder our Separatists from subscribing to it: And if we content our selves to teach the one without insisting upon the other, we shall do no more than what the Council of *Trent* by her silence hath given us an example of.

But since we have made it so easie, that seeing God face to face, they cannot but know our necessities, and hear our Prayers; and since we beg the Prayers of the Faith-

upon earth, we may well conclude, it ery expedient to have recourse to those are in a more sublime and safe condi- of Sanctity, to whom the sight of God eals what is necessary both for them to ow, and us to receive.

CHAP. X.

Of the HONOUR *given to* IMAGES.

Our Profession of Faith saith thus, and no more; I FIRMLY AVOW, HAT THE PICTURES OR IMAGES F *JESUS CHRIST*, OF THE LESSED MOTHER OF GOD AL- WAYES A VIRGIN, AND OF OTHER AINTS, OUGHT TO BE KEPT AND ESERVED, AND THAT HONOUR ND VENERATION IS DUE UNTO HEM; AND ALSO, THAT THEIR ELIQUES OUGHT TO BE REVE- ENCED: Words taken out f the Council of *Trent*: which *Sess.* 25. ore distinctly expresseth it self ms. *Not that we believe there is in them*

any

any Divinity or Vertue for which they
to be honoured, or that we ought to
thing of them, or place any confidence
said Pictures; but because the honour we
them is refer'd to the Prototype or thing
presented; insomuch that by the Pictures
kiss, or before which we kneel, or put off
hats, we adore Christ, and reverence
Saints, whom these Pictures represent. T
is an Article of Faith, in the performan
whereof we do no more than what M
sters ordain in their Discipline
ch. 10. Let all be uncover'd when the Psa
Art. 2. are sung, as well in the beginning
end of the Sermon, and during
celebration of the Sacraments: no more th
they practise towards the Elements of th
Cene, (which according to them is o
a figure or sign, which differs little fr
an Image.) And Lastly, no more than th
give to Baptism, and to the words of
Psalms.

Many Opinions relating to this subject
are not of Faith, no more than the Probl
matical Questions of the Shools. As for
Prototypes of Images, the Council m
tions none but of *Christ*, of the B. Virg
Mary, and of the Saints, abstaining to spe
of those expressions of the Trinity,
of God according to his Divine Natu
Son

Catholique Authors produced by *Vas-*
to wit, *Henricus*, *Abulen-*
Durandus, and *Martinus de* 3.p.disp.103
la, say, it is not any ways chap.3.
ful to frame Pictures of the
nity, but onely of God in his humanity:
other opinion, though it be not so cer-
, as that we may avow it as a Doctrine
Faith, seems to me, saith he, more pro-
ble, and it cannot be deny'd without
e temerity against the common use of
Church, That it is not unlawful in it
to paint the Trinity; which he proves
ply, and confirms by the frequent use of
Church, as well at *Rome* as other places,
ere pictures of the Trinity are often ex-
'd to the Reverence of the people: But
Council of *Trent* has determin'd nothing
the afore-cited place; onely commands,
if at any time the History of the holy
rit be painted (intending those where
d is to be represented) that great care
taken to explicate it so well to the peo-
, as that they may understand, that the
inity of it self is invisible to the eyes of
e body, and that this is onely an expressi-
of some Apparition or other Action of
od, suitable to our humane conception.
It is a great Question, whether God did
rbid the Jews all use of Images or no?

Many famous Authors, saith *Vasquez*, (which opinion seems very probable to me) *assirm*, *that all use whatsoever of Images or Statues was forbidden the Jews, by the positive Precept of God, besides the Adoration of the Gentiles, which was forbidden formerly by the Law of Nature. As for the Cherubins of the Ark, they were onely placed by way of ornament, not expos'd as the object of Worship: and truly there was no Reverence at all given them by the Jews, as far as we can understand, it being onely esteem'd a ceremonial Precept.* And the Council of *Trent* sayes nothing against this.

Disp. 104. chap. 2.

As for the honor given to *Pictures* we must observe, that neither our profession of Faith, nor the Council of *Trent* make any mention at all of adoring the pictures of Christ, much less those of the Saints: And whether this honour be termed Adoration or no, is a Question in the Schools, and a Question rather of the name than the thing. The Common-People now adays for antiently it had a larger signification, usually understand by this word (*Adoration*) absolute *Latria*, and to adore a Picture in this sense is no less then Blasphemy; in as much as when we say, we adore the Cross it must be in the sence the Council declares and allows, that by it and the Images

pe

senting *Jesus Christ*, which we kiss, and
ore we kneell, we adore *Jesus Christ*
self.

It is a problematical Opinion, Whether
honor we give to the pictures of Saints
a Religious honor? The Angelical Doct-
holds the negative; and will have a Reli-
s honor due to none but God; not to
Saints themselves, much less to their
tures.

It is also a disputable Quest. which is deba-
among Catholique Authors, of the Qua-
f this Honour. *Vasquez* pro-
Three Opinions currant 3 p. *disp.*
he Schools; The first is, 108.
t though Pictures are ho-
'd in respect of the Prototype, yet
e is a particular honor allotted them,
acted from the former, as they are or-
ents of the Church, and that this honor
an inferior quality, which is also exten-
to the Vessels and other Utensils of the
rch.

The second is, That Images may be ho-
'd in two respects, in themselves (ac-
ding to the former explication) and by
dent; and when they are honour'd by
dent, joyntly with the thing represented,
require the same worship as the Pro-
pe.

The third and most received Opinion among Divines is, That the picture abstracted from the Prototype, is not capable of any honor at all, but that whosoever honours a Picture must do it with reference to the thing represented. He refutes the second honor mention'd in the first and second Opinion, and proves strongly, that we ought only to honour the Prototype in the Picture and by it; particularly alledging the Council of *Trent*, *That we ought to reverence Pictures, not believing any Divinity or power or virtue in them, but that by the Pictures which we kiss, and before which we kneel, we adore Jesus Christ, and venerate the Saints represented.* By these words the Council constitutes Pictures no otherwayes the object of our kneeling and kissing, but as they lead us to the things represented, to which we ought to direct our thoughts really and cordially. For this second Proof he demonstrates very apparently, that no inanimated and unreasonable thing is in it self, or can be capable of honour, reverence or worship; but the Picture of it self is no other; Therefore, &c. since it is not capable of such an excellency to which a man may reasonally submit, for the act of submission can only in reason be directed to an object which we conceive our Superior, or endow

faith some more excellency: no man submitting to a lower than himself, much less to an irrational or inanimated creature: and whosoever should yeild a submission upon this score of servitude, should prevaricate from reason, and commit a kind of Superstition and Idolatry, in acknowledging a Superiority where it is not due

All the worship proceeding from an interiour affection, is ever directed to the Prototype, adored, if God, honoured, if Saints or Persons constituted in authority. The act of worship comprehends two things, the exteriour sign Kneeling, and the interiour affection directed to him that is endowed with eminency, and from thence claims a superiority, which can only belong to the Prototype, and not at all to the Picture, which is capable of no excellency superiour to us: the Intention of exhibiting this mark of submission is directed wholly to the thing represented: But this outward mark or sign of kneeling, &c. is performed to the Image; and by reason that kneeling and kissing is part of the worship, it is commonly called (saith *Vasques*) an honour or worship of that which we touch corporally, or to which this sign is made. This kissing being applyed to the Picture, the Picture indeed is honour'd, but only so, that the ho-

honour may pass to the Prototype. On
contrary, the Picture is neither prayed
nor praised, no not so much as by accid
The same Author teaches, that what is
to images, ought also to be understood
the honour given to the name of *Jesus*,
the books of the Gospel, to the holy Cr
to the Reliques of the Saints, and to the
cred Vessels.

The Doctrine thus clearly explicated,
so easie and convincing, even by the ligh
Reason, that men must renounce their
ture, if they refuse to submit and pay
honour due to Pictures, *Daillé* both in
Apology, and in this *Treatise of Pictures*,
most Catholique in his Subject, and g
more to Images than *Vasques*, being bo
Jesuite and a Spaniard; for *Daillé* av
both this latter honour and the secund
which *Vasques* refuses. Let us
c.10.p.65. *Daille* speak for himself in his
pology. *The Adoration of the*
(citing the *Psalm* 98. 5. *Adore his foot*
prostrate your selves before his footsteps)
species of honour less then Latria, *which*
due to God alone: And in his *Treatise of*
ges he expresses himself more distinc
thus, *We find that some in St.* Austins *time*
paint both our Lord and his Apo
p. 511 *upon the walls of their houses, w*

Protestants omit not to do at this day: And Protestants make no difficulty to receive ures into their Churches. And concerning neration; *A converted* Jew (according he Relation of Pope *Gregory*)

seased by force the Synagogue of l.7.*Ep.*5. *Nation, and therein placed a- tifix, and the Picture of the B. Virgin* Ma- *But* Gregory *restor'd the Synagogue to the s, taking away with much reverence the tures, as moveables of the Church.* And her, *If St.* Gregory *should have said in ress terms, That we ought to use Venera- towards Images, it would be still conside- s, What sort of Worship he meant? Whether eligious worship, as they pretend at* Rome, his is demonstrated false) *or of an infe- degree of honour, which is due only to the ruments of Religion,* (and this is as ch as we require) *and to the Persons and nsils of the Church, as Priests, Chalices, the y Books,* which every one calls *Venerable.* hold *Daillé* a perfect Catholique in this nt, and yet *Drelincourt* goes farther, and es no scruple to call it Religious Wor- , which is given to Pictures, and so in- holds more in that point than he is ob- d, to be a Catholique.

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

Of SATISFACTION.

Quest. 54. dub. 4.

I Am much taken with [illegible] ques expression in his [illegible] tise of Penance, That God [illegible] mit us the pain due for sin [illegible] mands of us not a satispassion, but a satisf[illegible] on (a very useful Distinction): Note [illegible] this is understood by way of Merit; [illegible] therefore it has not its effect but only [illegible] just man. We are not delivered from [illegible] pain by satispassion, but by satisfaction [illegible] that in the nature of Merit towards [illegible] From hence we conclude, That th[illegible] make satisfaction to God, not only by [illegible] works, but also by those of any other [illegible] and that every meritorious work is al[illegible] tisfactory. His Reason is this, That [illegible] the works of Merit we ack nowledge [illegible] dignity of Eternal Life, and of an Ex[illegible] of Sanctity, why not also a Remissi[illegible] Temporal pain? this being ordained [illegible] tain the other. And a little after, Sati[illegible] on is performed by way of Merit, and [illegible] requires a good work worthy of such pr[illegible] recompence; but he that works well is [illegible] worthy of Eternal Life, but merits also to [illegible]

'd from all impediment of attaining it:
herto *Vasques*.

We have hitherto gain'd a subscription
n our Adversaries in the point of *merit*;
therefore (the question being rightly
ed) we require the same in matter of sa-
ction; for, How can they rationally
y that good works should take away the
poral punishment due to sin, since for-
ly they granted that eternal life was
ited and obtained by Good works? But
e their dislike grows from a misunder-
ding of these our Satisfactions, I in-
d to speak more distinctly of them, and
andle them particularly in this place, be-
I fall upon *Purgatory*, and *Indulgences*,
eason of the natural connexion of these
stions the one with the other.

y one holds (says the Council *Sess.14.*
rent) *that we do not satisfie God*, can. 13.
ugh the merits of Christ for our
in what concerns the temporal pain due un-
em, by such punishments as he sends us, or
enjoyned by the Priests; no nor by those
ch we voluntarily perform of our selves, as
Fasting, Prayer, Almes, and other works of
, Anathema. And again, [*can.14.*] *If any*
ay, that the Satisfactions (*which Penitents*
emed by Christ, perform for their sins, do
ure the benefit of Christs death, Anathe-

ma. These are Articles of Faith.

Let us now separate the Doctrines of t
Schools, and all Problematical Questio
as formerly we did in the point of *Ad*
It is not of Faith that our *Satisfactions*
of condignity, or of congruity by Juſti
or by rigor of Juſtice, or by mercy; but
is of Faith, *That through the merits of Ch*
we ſatisfie for ſuch pains, and that by Je
Chriſt *we ſatisfie for our ſins by the help of*
Satisfactions, which merits of Chriſt *pro*
meerly from his mercy towards us. This is e
dent in that the Council propoſeth noth
to be held of *condignity, Juſtice,* &c. A
that our Satisfactions for the temporal pa
are by way of merit, as I alledged form
ly out of *Vaſques.*

The Council, ſpeaking of our *Satisfa*
ons, mentions no more than what concer
the temporal pains. It doth not therefo
teach, that we can ſatisfie God for the gu
of ſin, neither venial nor mortal, nor a
thing at all concerning the Eternal pai
Satisfaction for the guilt is by ſome ſo ca
(ſays *Vaſques,* 3 p. *diſp.* 2. *Chap.* 1, 2.)
cauſe by it it ſeems, enough is done on the
of the ſinner. to blot out the guilt which he
contracted, and the guilt being once blotted
all the ground of offence is taken away: But
moſt approved Opinion among Divines,

that no man, though furnisht with the assistance of the grace of God, can either by contrition or any other good works perfectly and truly satisfie for sin. And again, *Chap.* 6. *The name of* Satisfaction *for mortal sin is so unpleasing to some of our Divines, that they will not condescend, that any satisfaction can be made for the guilt of sin, though assisted by the Grace and favour of God, but onely for temporal punishment after the guilt of sin, and eternal Pains are remitted* gratis: *For, if we should satisfie in any way for mortal sin, our Justification would not be* Gratis, *but in some manner relying upon works, which would absolutely destroy the nature of Grace. And since Christ hath fully and perfectly satisfy'd for our sin, it follows that our* Satisfaction *would be superfluous.*

Vasques goes yet further, and shows it is the Opinion of *Scotus* and other Divines, *that the just man cannot perfectly satisfie for his Venial sin*; and proves it thus: *We beg in every day in the Lords Prayer, That God would forgive us our venial, and quotidian sins, and the blotting out of venial sin is call'd in us* remission, *signifying the grace and favour of him that remits without payment.*

As for Satisfaction of the temporal pain due to sin, which yet remains to be explicated; The Council of *Trent* (*can.* 13, 14.)

will not at all allow our works satisfac
but onely by *Jesus Christ*, and his Mer
and that we satisfie in Christ, doing fr
worthy of Repentance, which receive
force from him, are offer'd to his Father
him, and by his means are accepted of
Father. According to which, as our acti
of Faith, Hope, Alms, Penance, and
Sacraments of Baptism, Eucharist, *&c.*
also the Sacrifice of the Mass, are not to
at all propitiatory, but by application of t
Propitiation performed by *Jesus Christ* up
the Cross.

Alphonsus de Castro, in his Bo
Quest 94. of Penance, (being willing to
dub. 1. swer that vulgar Objection
our Separatists; That Christ
ving satisfied for us, as well for the g
of sin, as the punishment both eternal
and temporal, It is a wrong done to his M
rit, and to his satisfaction, if we think
needful to satisfie by our works, as estee
ing his Death and Merit insufficient)
plies, *That the passion of* Christ hath so sa
fied for our sinnes, that God will not be satis
by it alone, in case it be not by us particul
applyed, which is done by the Sacraments,
by our good works; and yet withall he hath
pointed, that the passion and merit of Christ
ing as it were linked to our good works, our

faction may be accepted through his grace and *our, Ledesemus* seems inclinable to the me manner of speaking: *The* Lutherans ith he) *who seem so much to rely upon the sion of Christ, doubt not also to believe that ith is necessary for those that are of age of cretion, and Baptism for little children. erefore they are not wholly and effectually re- ved by the Merits of Christ, for they seek ith as we do good works; and as by Faith me according to their DICTAMEN, rists passion is applyed to them, so by Faith d Good Works we aim at the same nd.*

In the like manner both *Ledesemus* and *urandus*, by the Relation of *Vasques*, a- ee in saying, *That onely by the bounty and er goodness of God, in accepting our satis- tion, a man may satisfie by way of condignity the temporal pains due to sin.* And *Joannes edina* holds, That our Satisfaction cannot condign for the temporal pain, if pain of rgatory be of a different nature from the ins of this Life, and proves it thus; *that payes a Debt in a Different and er nature then what is due, needs the rcy of his Creditor for the accepting his ment. And so in our case* (sayes he) *the rcy of God is necessary for the accepting of our tisfaction.*

Let

Let us adde towards rendring our Catholick Doctrine easie, as well in the point of *Merit*, as *Satisfaction*, the Opinion of some Catholick Divines cited by *Vasques*; The first is, That the works of Just men, considered as they proceed from the help of the Grace of God, and admitting also the sanctity of the party, have no condignity or force of Merit, as to Eternal Life; But that the Merit and diguity wholly proceeds from the Providence and Covenant of God. To this Opinion adhere *Sotus, Gregorius, Gabriel, Ocam, and Alphonsus de Castro*, &c. and it is proved out of the Council of *Trent*, (*Sess.* 14. cap. 8, 9.) That our works of themselves bear no proportion with that great reward of eternal life if God did not of his mercy both promise and accept them. From this Doctrine some of them seem to conclude, That every good Work, done by man remaining in a pure naturality, without the help of Grace would be meritorious of Eternal Life, by the very acceptance of God; For, if God would bestow Eternal Beatitude upon man for such a work, that work would be made worthy of Eternal Life by the very acceptance or Promise of God. And on the contrary, the Promise of God, set aside the work, is of no va-

1.2.*disp.*214. chap. 1, 2.

validity at all. Some other Authors would also deduce from this Principle, that the works of man wrought by neceſſity may be accepted of God, as rewardable with Eternal Life, and by that means made meritorious.

As for *Satisfaction*, *Vaſques* (having cited the words of the Council of *Trent*) infers, That the Council determines, that all the dignity of our Satisfaction proceeds from our works being offered by *Chriſt*, and through him accepted by his Father; as if the Council ſhould ſay, our works are not ſatisfactory, if they were not offer'd by *Chriſt*, and accepted by the Father. And the ſame Reaſon ſeems to be of force in what concerns our Good Works, that they may be deem'd meritorious: For, if our works were ſatisfactory in themſelves, without acceptation, the Council would not ſay, It is a great Argument of the Divine Love, that the Puniſhments inflicted by God, are to him ſatisfactory.

The Second Opinion is of ſome pious Divines, who teach that the Works of the juſt (as they are Works of the juſt, and perform'd by the help of Grace) have ſome little dignity in them of Eternal Life, but a far greater in that they rely upon the goodneſs and Merits of *Chriſt*, and are in ſome manner

manner his proper Merits; and that the re-
son of Merit in the works of the Juſt is d-
duced clearly from this, that the Action
the juſt is not wholly his own action, but t
action of Chriſt; for Chriſt, as head hav
an influence upon the members, worke
and meriteth in that manner, that every ju
man may ſay with St. *Paul*, *Gal.* 2. 20.
live, no more I, but Chriſt lives in me. I fa
no more I, but Chriſt faſts in me. I meri
no more I, but Chriſt merits in me. Acco
ding to this ſenſe we ſay uſually, that o
good works, as they are water'd with th
blood of Chriſt, and offer'd up with his M
rits, become worthy of ſo large recompenſe
For, who can oblige God, either to promi
Life Everlaſting to our works; or that h
ſhould accept them for ſatisfaction of th
puniſhment due to our ſins, without whi
they are neither meritorious nor Satisfa
ctory.

The ſame *Vaſques* produces other Divin
that teach, the Merits of Chriſt are impu
to us upon ſeveral reſpects; not only, th
in conſideration of them the aſſiſtance
Grace may be given us to perform Go
Works, by which we may merit everlaſti
Beatitude; but alſo there is added anot
Imputation of the ſame Merits of *Chri*
and a ſpecial favour from God to thoſe ſa

Go

Good Works already performed by the
lp of his Grace, that they may be rendred
eritorious. And they say, that our works
ready acted in the state of Justice, and by
e help of Grace, are not in themselves,
d in their own circumstances of condigni-
to so great a reward, as is that of ever-
ing joy; and consequently they affirm,
is particular Imputation and Communica-
n of the Merits of *Christ* is done to the
d God by his favour may render our
rks worthy of this great reward, and his
ceptance may give them a just condig-
y.

Moreover God, who freely may deny
r Works the reward of eternal Life, hath
ely promised it: And all that God has
nted for our Salvation, he has granted in
nsideration of the Merits of *Christ*, being
duc'd by those merits to give us freely
at which he might in rigor have deny'd.
e must now (says *Vasques*) apply the
e Discourse of the Imputation of the Me-
s of *Christ* for satisfaction of temporal
nishment, that our works, performed in
ce, may become meritorious: and also
member what I hinted in the beginning of
Chapter, That our *Satisfactions* are not
ispashons, but Satisfactions by way of
nt, though in truth they have more force

to pay the debt of Punishment, than w
Merits have to obtain Everlasting Bea
tude.

CHAP. XII.

Of SATISFACTIONS and MERITS of another man.

I Have said something on this Subject be
fore, intending to enlarge my self in thi
Chapter. All acknowledg
3 p. *Tom.* 1. (saies *Vasques*) that no Ju
disp. 4. c. 5. man can merit for another ne
ther Grace nor Justificatio
nor the last degree or help towards it, bu
only for himself; According to which, ne
ther the B. Virgin, nor the Apostles hav
merited the least help of Grace for others
and therefore no Just man can perfectly sa
tisfie for another, nor any one under the no
tion of a creature: For this reason it wa
necessary, That a perfect Satisfactio
should be made for our sinnes, and tha
Christ should become man, who alone wa
capable to satisfie for the sins of man: Th
Merit of Grace or Glory is in it self so pe
sonal, that no man can bestow his Me
upon another, to the end it may avail fo
th

the gaining of Glory, or become the price of that great reward; but it muſt be His proper and perſonal work, for by it alone man is made worthy of everlaſting Life. Thus you ſee, no creature, not the *B. Virgin* her ſelf, can either merit the Remiſſion of our ſins, or Glory, or Grace. This Prerogative is proper to *Jeſus Chriſt*, excluſively of all creatures: Our Separatiſts do not queſtion us upon this point, but onely whether Satisfaction may be made for the temporal pain due to another mans ſin, the guilt being taken away. For their better ſatisfaction, and to facilitate their Return to the Church in this point, I ſay,

It is not an Article of Faith, That a man, though juſt, can ſatisfie for the pain due to the ſin of another man already forgiven. I ſhew it by our *Rule of Faith*, for the Council of *Trent* does not at all propoſe unto us, that we can ſatisfie for another or for the temporal Puniſhment due to another mans ſin.

Suarez, treating this Subject, produces ſeveral Opinions, The Firſt, of ſome Modern Divines, that no faithful man can ſatisfie for another either living or dead, or pay the puniſhment due to another mans ſin, but onely implore of God a Remiſſion *Gratis* of pain for ſins committed,

or the Grace to do works worthy of Penance: The ground of this Opinion is, because the Debt of Puniſhment is a perſonal Debt; ſince man by reaſon of his ſin is in himſelf worthy of Puniſhment, not in another, and therefore he contracts a Debt which muſt be paid, either by the Action or Paſſion of the Debter himſelf, and not of another. The enſuing Diſcourſe of *Suares* upon this ſubject is very uſeful.

The Fundamental Reaſon of this ought to be derived from the Divine Inſtitution, in what regards Rewards or Puniſhments. A man can determine nothing in reſpect of the nature of the thing it ſelf, but in relation to the ſoveraign will of the Legiſlator, who might have preſcribed only *Purgatory* for the Puniſhment of ſin remitted, and then it had been impoſſible to make any ſatisfaction at all in this life: he might alſo have extended this disjunctive ſo far, that man ſhould either ſuffer ſuch a pain in Purgatory, or ſatisfie in this life, either by himſelf or his friends, and then (in what concerns the Divine Law) it had been ſufficiently ſatisfied by this means. This Doctrine explicates very plainly, as well the point of *Satisfaction*, as that of *Merits*: and *Vaſques* affirms, that the Satisfaction of one for another relates to the conſent of God, accepting a Satisfaction

where-

whereby to take away the Debt as well of Guilt as of Puniſhment. But *Suares* adds thus in the place alledged, we have no Teſtimony from the *Scripture*, or from *Tradition*, by which we are ſufficiently convinced, that there is any ſuch Divine Inſtitution, but rather what is formerly ſaid, may be expounded in rigor of ſatisfaction by way of Impetration.

Suares (in the laſt place cited) adds that among thoſe who teach, We may ſatisfie for another: The Firſt Opinion is, That this Satisfaction depends upon the free acceptance of God, and that it is not infallible, though it be offer'd by a juſt man, and for a juſt man; ſo ſay *Medina* and *Corduba*; and their ground is, becauſe the Judg is never obliged to accept the Satisfaction due from a Criminal by another hand, though it were perhaps equal, but uſually to puniſh the Delinquent himſelf, it being neither derived from Scripture, nor Tradition, that there is any ſuch known Law or Promiſe, that God will accept ſatisfaction from any other hand, becauſe it is generally eſteem'd that it properly belongs to *Jeſus Chriſt*, as well to merit as to ſatisfie condignly for others. And a little after he delivers his own Opinion thus: *We have no certain Revelation of this Promiſe or Divine Covenant, nor*

nor yet convincing or very pressing Reasons derived from revealed Principles; Notwithstanding it is not likely to be true, and it is more credible than otherwise, that God hath favourably established this Law, to the end we may satisfie for our selves and friends.

The same Author [*Sect.* 6.] speaking of *Satisfactions* offer'd to God for the dead, shows (according to the Opinion of approved Divines) *That Satisfaction for the souls in Purgatory is only of Mercy*, which is held by *Cajetan*, *Canus*, *Soto*, &c. The proper and only Reason is, because there is no Promise or Divine Covenant that God accepts our Satisfactions for the dead, of which this is a pregnant sign, That the Church and the Saints implore God, that he will vouchsafe to accept the Suffrages for the deceased: It is therefore an evident Argument, that it is a work of mercy, not of justice, and we may also gather it from thence, that the souls in Purgatory are out of all Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, and only liable to the Judgment and will of God: Since then it is not certain that there is any such Covenant in the behalf of the Living, it is very unlikely there should be any for the Dead; it being no ways apparent by any sufficient Testimony or Reason. And hence it is we say usually, that the Souls in Purgatory receive help

by

by way of Suffrage, from our Satisfactions, and Indulgences of the Church, by which is sufficiently excluded the conceit of any infallible application by way of Justice. And then he delivers his own Opinion thus, *If it be infallible, it must needs follow from some Law or Divine Promise, for Infallibility can proceed from no other ground.*

What I have said of *Satisfaction* for another, ought to be understood of *Merit* for another, to wit, That it is no Article of Faith, that we can merit for another not only by *Condignity* (which all Doctors reject) but even by *Congruity*. I prove it thus, This very term *Merit by Congruity* is not found in the Council, much less, *Merit by Congruity for another man*, therefore not of Faith. Besides we do not find in Scripture any mention of a Divine promise or Institution, that one Just man may merit for another; and yet, all depends upon this Promise, as well in regard of *Merit* as *Satisfaction*; and *Satisfaction* is (as I said before) by way of *Merit*, but since it is not of Faith, that we can satisfie for another, it is no wonder at all that we cannot *merit* for another, both being by way of Impetration and Prayer, which have no Infallible Effect for want of a Promise, by which God is solely obliged.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

Concerning the TREASURE *of* SATISFACTION *from the Merits of Saints.*

IT is not an Article of Faith, That there is any such Treasure in the Church, nor deduced by consequence, (as I shall shew hereafter) that *Indulgences* are granted upon that score. I prove it by our *General Rule of Faith*; for, neither the Council of *Trent*, [*Sess.* 25.] which is of *Indulgences*, nor any other General Council proposeth any such Doctrine: 'Tis true, some such thing is mentioned in the *Extravagant Unigenitus of* Clement *the* 6th. and it is only contained in the *Depositive*. The Pope produces nothing there but his own Opinion, writes only to a particular man, and proposeth nothing to the whole Church, neither is the Definition of a Pope sufficient to settle an Article of Faith. Look back upon our *General Rule of Faith*, and withall consider my former Argument, That one Just man cannot satisfie for the sins of another, either living or dead: and this pretended Treasure will soon vanish away.

de Pœnitentia & Remissione.

Suarez

Suarez upon this Subject, affirms, That ſides *Mayron*, *Durandus* has abſolutely de'd this Treaſure of the Church compoſed the Merits and Satisfactions of the Saints, d produceth Two Reaſons; The Firſt is, e ſame of *Mayron*, to wit, that the Merits Saints are condignly recompenſed in their wn perſons: The Second, That the Saints ve no Superfluous Merit; for all avail's, is efficacious in way of reward, and no ing remains to be put to this Treaſure. And little lower he ſaies, ſome hold, That all orks, as they relate to Satisfaction, are ſo dividually his that acts, or ſuffers, that one but *Jeſus Chriſt* can beſtow them upon nother, or pay anothers debt. According which Doctrine we may affirm confident-, That the Treaſure of the Church is not mpos'd of the Merits of Saints, and that othing of that is applied by way of Indul-nce, for the Payment of Temporal Pu-iſhments.

It is true, *Suarez* ſeems to approve, as a mmon Opinion of Divines, That there is Treaſure of Merits and Satisfactions diſ-enc'd by the Church, which he endeavours prove; but withall, in the Name of thoſe at deny this Treaſure, he has theſe words, *advertiſe you, that they deny not but that the orks of the Juſt remain in ſome manner in the*

Treasure of the Church, as to procure for us Intercession, and Merit, by way of Congruity several Benefits. I believe our Seperatists themselves will easily admit a Treasure upon this score, presupposing (what I formerly noted) that many grave Divines will give way to this word *Merit of Congruity*, or *Satisfaction of Congruity* for our selves, more less for others.

In fine, This Treasure (according to the Divines alledged by *Suares*, treating of the Merits and Satisfaction of Saints) will amount to no more, than that the good Life and good Works of the Saints have a prevalent vertue and force for the obtaining of many benefits, and that the Divine Goodness affords several Favour and Graces to the Living, upon that consideration. And farther I presume, our Seperatists will not deny this Doctrine, nor the communication of this Treasure, so often and so clearly down in the Scripture; God said to *Jacob* Gen. 26. 24. *I will bless thee for Abraham sake my servant*, Psal. 37. 35. *For the love of David thy servant avert not thy face from thy Anointed:* meaning *Solomon. Do not reject the Prayers which the king offers for his people in general*, according to the Gloss of Geneva. *I will defend this City for Davids sake my servant.* They seem also to admit the Intercessio-

ceſſion of the Saints in heaven; and to ac-
wledg; that God beſtows many favors
their ſake, which is in effect to admit
Traaſure in our ſence. And why are we
then agreed in this Point?

CHAP. XIV.

Of PURGATORY.

Ur Profeſſion of Faith hath theſe
Words; I HOLD CONSTANT-
THAT THERE IS A PURGATO-
Theſe are extracted out of the Coun-
of *Trent.* [*Seſſ.* 25.] This is an un-
ted Article of Faith, being decreed by
Council. But on the contrary it is no
cle of Faith, That there is a Fire in
gatory. *Bellarmin* [*lib.*2 *cap.*11.] upon
Subject delivers, as a currant Opinion
ng Divines, That there is a true and
per Fire in *Purgatory* of the ſame ſpecies
our Elementary fire: which Opinion
of Faith, becauſe never defin'd by the
rch; nay the Greeks proteſted againſt
the Council of *Florence*, and that Coun-
the laſt Seſſion defin'd *Purgatory*, with-
mentioning the Fire; and yet I hold it a
probable Opinion. By this you ſee (ac-
ng to *Bellarmin*) that it is no Article of

Faith, no more than where the place of
gatory is, in which the Church alſo hath
ſin'd nothing.

Moreover, Tis not defin'd what
Pains of Purgatory are, nor how grie
though (according to *Bellarmin*) all a
them greater than the Puniſhments of
life, which is alſo variouſly underſtood:
Thomas holds, That the greateſt Pain i
world is leſs than the leaſt of *Purgatory*:
St. *Bonaventure* teacheth, That the Pa
loſs or privation in *Purgatory* is not gr
than any the Puniſhment of *Purgatory*,
any the Puniſhment of this life. Tha
Pains of *Purgatory* are greater than th
this life in this ſence, that the grea
Purgatory are more grievous than the g
eſt in this life, though there may be
in *Purgatory* leſs Puniſhment than the
in this life: And this Opinion I rather
unto: Hitherto *Bellarmin*.

It is not alſo of Faith, How long the
of Purgatory laſt. *Soto* (by Relation o
Larmin) is of Opinion, That no man
longer in *Purgatory* than ten years; wh
rejects in theſe words, *To determine a*
ſo uncertain cannot be done without T

The way to an Agreement in this
is both eaſie and plain, by ſeparatin
Opinions as are not of Faith, and

P

ounding only what the Church obliges us o accept, compar'd with what the Sepa-atists themselves maintain. *Calvin* in his *stitutions*, *lib.* 3. *c.* 25. *Sect.* 6. placeth e souls of the Faithfull after death, even o the day of Judgment, in a place out of eaven, where they expect (saith he) the uition of the glory promised, and all things emain in suspence untill our Saviour appear s our Redeemer. This suspension or ex-ectation must needs be grievous, in regard e Object expected is so vehemently de-red. Here is undoubtedly a third place, esides Heaven and Hell, where pain is ffer'd by the Faithful deceased, even to e day of Judgment. This *Purgatory* of *alvin* is more lasting, more general, and onsequently more troublesome in the Cir-umstances, than what the Church propo-eth by the Council of *Trent*.

But, Suppose a Faithful person dye sur-riz'd by an Apoplexy, with some little isorder of sin, for which he is not in the ate of damnation, this soul must of ne-essity be purged, before she can be ad-mitted into Heaven, *wherein nothing that is oul can enter*. This Soul therefore must be or some time in Purgatory, or at least in a hird place. But since (according to our eparatists in their Confession of Faith) their

their sins are not imputed to them in this life, but the fault or guilt remains still; it is necessary for the attaining of heaven, where nothing can enter that is foul; and though the filth be not in this world imputed, yet after this life all filth and faults must be wash'd away, and purged: where? not in heaven, for there nothing foul can be admitted; nor in earth, for, according to them, the guilt of sin is not remitted there: It must be then out of the world, and out of heaven, in a third place where they are really purged both from guilt and sin; and that being the common place for the Faithful, they must go all into *Purgatory*. Finally, If the Doctrine, that the body of *Jesus Christ* is contain'd under the symbols of the Eucharist, hath no venome in it, nor prejudice to piety, why should there be any in this of *Purgatory*, as it is deliver'd in the sence of the Church. They ought therefore to believe it, according to *Daillé*, under pain of being esteem'd neither good Christians, tolerable Citizens, or men of common sence.

CHAP.

CHAP. XV.

Of SUFFRAGES *for the* DEAD.

OUr *Profeſſion of Faith*, taken out of the Council of *Trent*, ſaies thus: I FIRMLY HOLD, THAT THE SOULS IN PURGATORY ARE RELIEVED BY THE SUFFRAGES OF THE FAITHFULL: But theſe enſuing Opinions are not of Faith, in which the Council is altogether ſilent. *Cajetan* teacheth, (as *Bellarmine* relates) that all ſouls are aſſiſted by the common Suffrages of the living, but thoſe for whom particular Suffrages are offer'd, are not reliev'd, unleſs, whilſt they were here on earth, they had a ſpecial care and Devotion for the Keyes of the Church, and for the ſouls departed. Others ſay, the ſuffrages offer'd for a particular man, are not only available to him, but to all the ſouls in general, and no leſs to them than to him. But the common Opinion ſeems to hold a middle way, That Suffrages offer'd for a particular man, are only to him beneficial by way of *Satisfaction* for whom they are offer'd, and this Doctrine *Bellarmine* labours to prove.

It

It is not also of Faith, whether *Suffrages* are beneficial by way of Satisfaction or Intercession: *Suarez*, in his Treatise of *Suffrages*, moving this difficulty, demands, whether temporal Pains are not sometimes remitted *Gratis*, by the Merits and Prayers of Just men, who beg it of God by their Prayers, without tendering or performing any thing by way of Satisfactions. The First Opinion answers this Question, and affirms generally, that this way of imploring by way of *Suffrage*, is not only possible, but that we can give no other assistance certain and effective but this. This is constantly held by most, and chiefly by those Divines who reject Satisfaction one for another; being an undoubted Principle, that our *Suffrages* cannot be more efficacious for the dead, than for the living.

The second Opinion affirms, that the means of remitting *Gratis*, by way of Intercession, is sometimes obtained, though the other also is more practicable by paying an equal price. The former is grounded upon this reason, That the Church doth often pray to God for the delivery of souls out of *Purgatory*, by his bountiful and pure mercy; therefore she pretends to obtain Remission *Gratis*, and moreover, that Prayer hath such virtue in it self, as to obtain

without an equal price: And *Suarez* fur-
adds; This opinion is pious and proba-
yet I say, two things; the First, That this
of Remitting is uncertain, and not
roughly grounded: Secondly, That it
ms very probable to many, that God ne-
remits Pain due for sin, if they do not
er or apply a condign Satisfaction, and
he never doth it altogether *gratis*, with-
observing the rule of vindicative Justice.
fully perswaded, no man can obtain
himself *gratis* a remission of Pain due for
; therefore none can obtain it for another
living, much less for the deceased in
gatory. The same Author adds, That of
se who admit suffrages by applica-
of our Satisfactions for the dead,
opinion is, That Satisfaction for
souls in Purgatory is onely of mercy.
Reason is, becaufe there is nothing
Promise or Covenant from God in this
e, which is an evident sign, that the
urch implores God to accept these Suf-
ges for the dead.

Hence I infer, That neither the one nor the
r way of Suffrage is of Faith: to wit,
her by Intercession *gratis*, or tender of
isfaction, but onely in general, according
he Profession of Faith, that the souls are
ved by the Suffrages of the Faithful;
rest belongs to the Schools, and not to

the certainty of Faith. The same *Suarez* pro-
Disp. 53. duceth also some Authors, saying
Sect. 3. Private Suffrages offer'd for the dead
have no such vertue as to be infallibly ac-
cepted, And some others conceive, the Sa-
crifice of the Mass is not of that certainty
or any other work whatsoever, as infallibly
to free a soul in Purgatory, *ex opere operato*.
3 p. disp. *Vasques* goes on thus. Let us see
228. c. 4. whether the Remission of Pain be
so certainly attain'd by vertue of this Sacri-
fice, that it alwaies hath effect by a certain
Law or Promise; *Sotus*, *Canus*, *Corduba* are
of Opinion, that this Sacrifice works con-
stantly the Remission of Punishment by a
certain Law, in what relates to the living
though not to the dead, but that it is beneficial to them by way of Suffrage. The
way of Suffrage (according as they un-
derstand it) is, that the prayers of the li-
ving avail the deceased, as God is pleased
to accept them, and that there is no certain
Law establisht for the Remission of temporal
Punishment due to sin: And moreover that
the Sacrifice of the *Mass* is available this
way, and the like of Indulgences granted for
the dead; and as they esteem the effect of
Indulgences less certain in regard of the dead
than the living, so they judge of the Sacrifice
of the *Mass*, yet the common and most ap-
proved Opinion is, that this effect of remis-
tin-

g pain, as well to the dead as the living is
wages given, and that it is so ordain'd by
od by a certain Law. And to this Opini-
adhere such as teach, That the Suffrages
hich by the Faithful are offer'd for the dead
e certainly available: This is abundantly
ficient to show what is of *Faith* in this Sub-
ct, and what of *Opinion*.

From these Premises, and from *Disp.* 229
hat is added by *Vasques* it is clear, chap. 1.
t neither the Sacrifice of the *Mass*, nor
y other Suffrage works a Remission of
n, *ex opere operato*, which is the term of
Schools, though variously expounded by
r own Doctors.

We are then agreed, (presupposing *Pur-*
y, to which I open'd a way in my last
apter,) And now (laying aside all misun-
standings, and the Problematical Questi-
of the Schools) I shall insist upon the
e method I made choice of in the Questi-
of *Satisfaction* or *Merits for another*. For,
o can deny, That God hath granted ma-
favors at the Prayers, and in considerati-
of the Sanctity of his most Faithful Ser-
nts, and particularly, for their sakes, abu-
the Punishment of such Demerits as de-
ved a severe chastisement? And why may
not then expect the same mercy in *Pur-*
y? Let us then conclude with barely

asserting our Profession of Faith, without
mixture of Opinions: THAT THE SOU
DETAIN'D IN PURGATORY ARE
LIEV'D BY THE SUFFRAGES OF TH
FAITHFUL.

CHAP. XVI.

Of INDULGENCES.

IN our Profession of Faith we say, I BE
LIEVE THAT THE POWER OF IN
DULGENCES HATH BEEN GIVEN
AND LEFT IN THE CHURCH, BY
SUS CHRIST; AND THAT THE US
OF THEM IS VERY BENEFICIAL T
ALL CHRISTIAN PEOPLE. The Coun
of *Trent* speaks the same in these wor
*Since the power of giving Indulgences hath be
bestowed upon the Church by* Jesus Christ, *a
that she hath made use of this power, which ha
been divinely left her even from ancient time
The holy Synod teaches and commends the us
Indulgences as very beneficial to all Christi
people, and approved by the authority of
holy Synods; and that they ought to be reta
in the Church, and denounceth Anathem
those who assert, they are unprofitable, or

have in a power in the Church of giving them. Notwithstanding she admonisheth, that the granting them be done with great moderation, according to the ancient and approved customs of the Church; for fear that by too great a remissness, Ecclesiastical Discipline be enervated.

This undoubtedly belongs to Faith, since it is propos'd by a General Council. On the contrary, Other Doctrines concerning *Indulgences*, not propos'd by the Church, are not of Faith; for since the Fathers of the Church (where there was a considerable number of Eminent Divines, vers'd in all sorts of Learning, and who particularly sifted this Subject) did adventure to propose no more; it is a demonstrative Argument to me, that we ought to own no more, as belonging to Faith, and hardly for a well-grounded Doctrine.

Hence I conclude, it is not an Article of Faith, That the Church has power to grant *Indulgences*, whereby the Punishment due (in the Court of God) to sin remitted, may be taken away, or the pains in Purgatory: much less is it an Article of Faith, That the Church, in the grant of these, hath any Intention to remit these Pains, but rather, that both the Power and the Intention go no farther, than to grant a Remission of

LIBRARY OF THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

of Canonical Penances heretofore very
verely impoſed. This appears, Firſt,
our foreſaid *Rule of Faith*; For the Co
cil neither mentions the one nor the oth
of theſe Pains due to ſin, and conſequently
they are not within the verge of Faith, be
longing to Indulgences: Secondly, it is
torious, That the Council does not oblige
to acknowledge any other power of Indu
gences in the Church, than the undoubte
uſe of them by Authority of Holy Synod
and according to the Ancient approved C
ſtoms of the Church.

Tom. 1. *of Ind.* Disp. 49. Sect. 2. *Suarez*, treating this ſub
ject, ſayes thus; The Co
cil of *Trent*, mentioning
uſe of Indulgences approved by Gene
Synods, intends thoſe that are uſually
to that purpoſe, as that of *Nice*, can.
the Fourth of *Carthage*, chap. 75. of *N
ceſaria*, ch. 3. of *Agdes*, can. 6. of *Lao
can.* 1. & 2. But we only read, in the
That it was alwayes lawful and uſual
Biſhops to remit their Penitents ſome
of thoſe publick Canonical Penances, wh
were often inflicted for certain heino
Crimes, if the life and laudable conver
tion of the Penitent did ſeem to deſerve
great a favour. And we do not gather a
from theſe Synods, that this Remiſſion
tend

ided to diminish the obligation of the Pu-
ishment due before God; and therefore we
annot draw from thence any solid Argu-
ent, but, at most, a conjecture by some
obable inducement.

The same Author having cited at large
e Testimonies of S. *Cyprian*, *Basil*, *Gre-*
y of *Nice*, besides several Synods, even
the time of S. *Cyprian*, and from thence,
that of S. *Gregory* the Great, concerning
e remission of Punishments, ordained as
ell by the Discipline of the Church for
blique sins, as by the Sacrament of Pe-
nce, *in foro exteriore*, concludes thus:
is easie to evince, by these Testimonies
dged, That it was an ancient custom in the
imitive Church, to remit sometimes these
nances, either by pardoning them after they
re imposed, or, having absolved the Penitents
foro exteriore, by a mitigation of the Pe-
nce enjoyned; But it is somewhat difficult to
plicate how we may prove by this way of re-
ssion, that there was then, as now, (pre-
uded by some) the use of Indulgences, since
at Remission precisely taken, did not blot out
Obligation due to sin remitted; and the
relate, receiving the Penitent to the peace
d unity of the Church, without any such con-
sion, did not free him from the pain of Pur-
ory, but left it so as that it was necessary for

the

the said Penitent to make a further Satisfaction, either through the fervour of his Conversion or by some other means. And after some Discourse upon this Subject, he concludes thus: *It doth not seem to me improbable to affirm that, in the times preceding* Gregory *the Great, by Indulgences were only remitted the Penances imposed by the Ministers of the Church, and not any pain due in the judgment of God; by reason that what we read of in those days doth not sufficiently evince the present use of Indulgences.*

And as for me (sayes *Suarez*) *All that I have alledg'd perswades me to this thought, for nothing I meet with fully satisfies me: Only from the ancient practice some conjectures may be drawn:* Thus far *Suarez.*

Wherefore considering the *major* of the Council, and the *minor* compos'd of these Inferences, I shall persist in my former Conclusion, of severing that which is not of Faith, from what is taught by the said Council, being farther induced unto it by some other Catholique Authors alledged by *Suarez* himself.

Some Catholiques say, That by *Indulgences* there is not any Remission at all of pain due to sin, in the judgment of God, but only the Obligation taken away of performing Canonical Penances impos'd by the

Church: and *Cajetan* teaches, That by *Indulgences* are only remitted the Penances impos'd by the Ministers of the Church; but not at all the Punishment due to sin in the Judgment of God; and farther, speaking not of the power, but present use of Indulgences, goes on thus: *Some have thought, that by Indulgences, which are now actually granted,* Suarez. disp. 19. Sect. 3. *there is no remission of pain due to sin, in the judgment of God, but only of the obligation of performing the Sacramental Penances; which opinion is old, and mention'd by S.* Thomas, *and S.* Bonaventure: *The ground of it is, because often* de jure *Indulgences are said to be granted for Penances enjoyned, as is evident in the chapter,* Cum ex de Pœnitentia, *&c.* From whence we may collect; That the general Form of granting *Indulgences* was of Penances enjoyned, since the Popes themselves grant *Indulgences* for seven Years, or forty Dayes, which numbers relate to the Penitential Canons, charging Penances according to the antient form of the Church, and the degrees of sins. In fine, This opinion is confirmed by the antient use of Indulgences, which, only for the relaxation of publique Penances, but after extended to Sacramental Penances, and so they continue to this day, and no more is remitted by Indul-

gences, but the rigor of Penances
joyn'd.

Bellarmin, lib. 1. c. 7. in his Book of *Indulgences*, saies thus; *This Position: That by Indulgences men are freed from the Obligation of punishment, not only in the face of the Church, but also, before God, was antiently denyed by some, reported and confuted by antient Divines*, as Thomas, *and others: I prove it* (saith he) *against those Catholicks who are not so rash in this point.* Hence I conclude it no Article of Faith, That the Church hath a power to remit, by *Indulgences*, the pains due before God, or in Purgatory; much less, That the Church, by the grant of Indulgences, hath any intention of remitting them, or doth actually remit them. And 'tis sufficient for Catholicks, to acknowledg the other Power and the exercise of it: And who can in reason reject this Power, and the Practice of it? Our Separatists themselves, grant Indulgences in the same sence.

Nor is it an Article of Faith, That the Church hath any Power to grant Indulgences for the Dead, or that by those Indulgences, a Soul may be delivered out of Purgatory: Or that by saying Mass on a privileged Altar, a soul may be delivered out of Purgatory; I prove this in the same manner as before; First, because the Council of Trent teacheth it not: Secondly, because the

lence of the Fathers of that Council (who were not ignorant of these Opinions and Practises) shews positively, that they did not own them to be of Faith. Thirdly, I prove it, out of what is affirmed by *Suarez*, *Disp.* 54. *Sect.* 1. *That some Catholick Authors hold, The Church can give Indulgences to the Living, but not to the Dead.* And in another place, *Disp.* 53. *Sect.* 1. he names *Hostiensis*, who absolutely denies that *Indulgences* avail the Dead.

Bellarmine, (*lib.* 1. *c.* 14.) affirms the same of *Gerson*, and produceth his reason, to wit, because Indulgences are ordained for those that submit to the Court of Mercy, which lasts even to death, and no farther; and that the grant of *Indulgences* is not an act of Jurisdiction over Purgatory. And the same *Suarez* witnesseth, that among those who admit *Indulgences*, some will not allow, that private suffrages offer'd for the Dead, have that efficacy as to be infallibly accepted, and some are of Opinion, that the Sacrifice of the Mass hath it not; and that there is no work that can *ex opere operato* free a soul from *Purgatory* by a certain and infallible Law. In fine, we have no Divine Promise upon which we may ground a certainty for the effect of *Indulgences*, and therefore we conclude them given only by way of Suffrage.

CHAP. XVII.

What CERTAINTY there is in the foresaid DOCTRINES.

SOme may object, Though these four Doctrines above-mentioned are not admitted to be of Faith, they have nothing of certainty in them? *Suarez* [*Disp. 49. Sect. 1.*] delivers his own sence thus: *We ought to say, There is a power in the Church of granting Indulgences by which souls are freed from from the punishment due before God for sins remitted*: And again, *I say, The Church has power to grant such Indulgences, as that thereby the temporal punishment due before God may be remitted even without the Sacrament of Penance.* I hold this assertion certain, for it depends upon what I have already shewed, making it appear, that there is a power in the Church of granting Indulgences, and that by Indulgences are understood a true Remission, which hath this very effect before-mentioned. He endeavors to prove it from several *Decretals* contain'd in the Canon Law, and from divers *Bulls*, in which this use of Indulgences is allowed, and by the common practise of the present Church; for otherwayes (as he sayes) it would be esteem'd

deem'd a gross error both in practise and morality: And though we should condescend to what some Catholicks avow, That the use of Indulgences is not very antient, but began in the time of S. *Gregory*, yet it cannot be reputed an error, considering how generally it was receiv'd and practic'd in the Church.

The same Author, [*Disp. 53. Sect. 1.*] demanding what certainty is produced concerning Indulgences for the Dead? answers; That because antiently the matter was not declar'd in the Church, some Catholicks have doubted of it, but now the practise is so constant, that it cannot be refused without danger of Error. First, by the common Opinion of the Schoolmen: Secondly, by the practice of the Church: Thirdly, by the Authority of many Popes, who both in Fact and Doctrine, have confirmed this Tenet. And *Bellarmin*, *lib. 1. c.* 5. teacheth the same, saying, *It is certain, and undoubted, that by* Indulgences *the Souls in Purgatory may be relieved.*

Suarez, in his Treatise of the *Treasure of the Church*, teaches thus, *We ought to say, that the Treasure of the Church is not only compos'd of the Merits of* Christ, *but also of the Merits of Saints.* This Assertion I hold certain, And a little after he adds, *Some will*

needs

needs say That Good works (as to the force of Satisfaction) are so individually belonging to him that acts or suffers, that no man besides Jesus Christ can bestow the merit upon another; Conformably to which opinion we must deduce this Consequence, that the Treasure of the Church is not compos'd of the Merits of Saints, and that nothing of them can be apply'd by way of Indulgence to the remitting of temporal paine. But I conceive, this Opinion (in as much as it excludes the Merits of Saints from the Treasure of the Church, and the use of Indulgences) to be erroneous, and ought to be avoided, in regard it contradicts the common Opinion of Divines, and the accustomed practice of the Faithful, and besides it supposeth a false ground that one just man cannot satisfie for another, and it contradicts the usual stile of the Popes &c. And again, I hold this Opinion, That one Faithful cannot satisfie for another, is false and very new in Divinity, and therefore fit to be avoided as a matter of importance. Hitherto Suarez; who without doubt ought to be understood, when he urgeth these four certainties, in such a sence as not to condemn these Authors of temerity who hold the contrary. For, if we should understand Suarez in that sence, he would appear temerarious himself, in condemning others of temerity, and contradict his own general Principle

ples, touching what is certain, and what not; but in a moderate sence they may be termed certainties.

Du Moulin, in his *Judg of Controversies*, delivers his mind thus, *When several persons of knowledg and Authority decide a difficulty, and chiefly, when they are such to whom God commands to pay a reverence and respect, it is a shameful thing to contradict, or not to submit to their judgment*: And is not the same Rule of Prudence requir'd in our Question?

But in case some persons, of a more rigid disposition, refuse to subscribe to these four rehearsed Opinions, by reason Antiquity took little or no notice of them, and the Council of *Trent* (though assembled specially upon the Subject of *Indulgences*, at that time deny'd by the Protestants, both in themselves, and in these four circumstances) hath pronounced nothing in confirmation of these four points; yet it is agreed, that the Popes do what is not onely good and profitable, but laudable in granting *Indulgences* for the dead, in distributing the Treasure of the Church, in allowing a Remission of Punishment due before God, and an application of Satisfactions, performed for others: For, in all these they take a sure way, and the Faithful ought to be zealous in

in the gaining *Indulgences*; Since if these Doctrines be true, as they are piously believed, the effect will follow; If they want a solid Foundation, at least, the effect cannot be other than good, since thereby the Faithful are invited to the performance of many special works of Piety and Charity, which never are unrewarded. And it is certain, That Physitian proceeds upon good Principles, and ought justly to be commended, that prescribes his Patient a Cordial, though he be not certain of the Effect, but only, that it can do no hurt, and may do good: So the Merchant in his Trade, and every Sober man in what he undertakes, proceeds prudently, though the gain be uncertain; which is plainly our case in the matter of *Indulgences* for the Dead, and saying Mass on priviledg'd Altars.

This seems agreeable to what *Vasquez* teacheth, *lib.* 2. *p.* 5. That the Church proceeds sometimes in her practice upon a probable Opinion without declaring it to be of Faith, in which he swerv's not from the rule of prudence and reason, as may be demonstrated in this particular of *Indulgences*, and shall appear more apparently in what I am to say in the next Chapter.

Notwithstanding, having a due regard to the weakness of our Separatists, whom we would

would willingly perswade into the bosome of the Catholick Church, by making the way as easie as we can. And since neither our *Profession of Faith*, nor the *Council of Trent*, take any notice of these Four Heads of Circumstances, the best way to deal with them is, not to press these opinions at all. For why should we propose more to them then what our Profession of Faith, and the General Councils engage us to? Is it not sufficient to make a man a true child of the Church, if he submits to these? and why should we be more exact, and rigid, than the Councils and the Popes? And in case our Separatists should of themselves urge these Four Heads, the shortest answer, and freest from all exception is, That since our Profession of Faith, and the Council of *Trent*, are silent in these questions, and that to submit, so far as they command, is abundantly sufficient to make a man a good *Catholick*, the other *Queries* will for the present rather appear a Digression than otherwise, but being once received into the Church, the Piety and probability of those Opinions will soon be illustrated, and grow more credible. In fine, Let us confess no farther than the words of our Profession of Faith imports, to wit, I BELIEVE THAT THE POWER OF INDULGENCES HATH BEEN GIVEN, AND LEFT

TO THE CHURCH, BY JESU
CHRIST; AND, THAT THE U
OF THEM IS WHOLSOME, AND
NEFICIAL TO CHRISTIAN PEOP
Let us go no farther, but follow the adv
of the Apostle, *Let none presume to be m
wise than behoves, but be wise unto sobriety.*

CHAP. XVIII.

What is less certain concerning INDULGENCES.

IT is so far from being an Article of Fa
that there is little or no certainty, w
ther, when *Indulgences* are granted, it be
on a sufficient consideration; As when a la
Indulgence is granted, for repeating so
few Prayers, or giving some petty Alms,
saying Mass for the Dead, on a priviled
Altar, and consequently, whether such Ind
gences be available: this I prove, 1. Beca
neither the Council of *Trent*, nor any oth
teaches us to believe, that such *Indulgen*
so frequent, with such circumstances,
such causes, as for one Mass, one Commu
on, or a few short Prayers, are availab
Nay the *Council* of *Trent* adviseth, that gr
eare and moderation be held in the granti

OT T

Indulgences according to the ancient and proved custome of the Church, which stionless was not to give such a multi-e of *Indulgences* upon so slender Conside-ons.

Both by Authority and Reasons alledg'd *Bellarmin* in his Treatise of *Indulgences*. *generally agree* (says he) *that an* Indul-ce *without a just*, that is, *sufficient Motive*, *t of force to expiate the Obligation of pain before God, either in this life or the next*: , having proved it amply, adds: Hence eth a Question, Whether to the sufficien-f the cause there is not required some portion be wixt the work enjoin'd, and *Indulgence*? Or whether large *Indulgen-* may be granted upon the performance mall works. The first opinion is, of those maintain, that the proportion is not re-ite, but it sufficeth, if the cause be pious, not for the performance of some vain or purely temporal, unbelonging to the our of God; but for any work whatso-, if it tend to the Glory of God, and the d of his Church. The Reasons for this nion are, for the most part taken from common Practice of the Church.

ut those that favour the contrary Opi-, say, That, to the end the cause may ust, it is required, that the work be not

only pious, but hold some proportion with the *Indulgence*: insomuch, that if a great Indulgence be granted upon a slender cause, it will not prove effectual: As this is the most generally received Opinion, so it seems to me (saith *Bellarmin*) the more rational and true; And I hold, for example, if a plenary *Indulgence*, should be granted for only saying our Lords Prayer for the Conversion of Hereticks, or for giving a small Charity towards the recovery of the holy Land, it would not be available.

In fine, to make the cause just, 'tis necessary, that the thing required by the *Indulgence* be more grateful to God, and more profitable to his Church, than the penitential satisfaction remitted by the *Indulgence*. But (the Cardinal adds) we must observe that, as there ought to be a just consideration, or cause, so it doth not appertain to every man to judg of it, nor take the liberty of censuring *Indulgences* as some Authors do.

And herein *Clement* the 8*th* is much to be commended for his care and Providence in executing the Decree of the Council of *Lateran* under *Innocent* the 3d, concerning the discreet moderation of *Indulgences*, and the Decree of the Council of *Trent* for reducing them to the ancient custome approved by the Church: For it is well known the Au-

ents were very reſerved in this particular ſince *Sergius Secundus* granted only for three years, and *Paſcalis* for 40 days. And then, having raiſed this Objection, That if *Indulgences* granted without ſome conſiderable cauſe were not valid, Chriſtian people would be much deceived by their Paſtors, which ought not to be admitted, anſwers thus: *There is generally no danger of deceit, for the people are taught it is an Article of Faith, That there is a power in the Church of granting* Indulgences, *but not, that it cannot happen, This particular* Indulgence *may be unvallid, or unbeneficial; which as it may happen ſometimes for want of Authority in the giver, ſo alſo ſometimes through deficiency in the cauſe. And therefore, all well adviſed Chriſtians ſo accept of* Papal Indulgences, *as that beſides them they are careful to perform works worthy of Penance, and make ſatisfaction for their ſinnes:* Hitherto *Bellarmin.*

How little reaſon our *Separatiſts* have to refuſe an Agreement and Subſcription to Indulgences thus expounded and aſſerted in the terms of our Profeſſion of Faith, extracted out of the Council of *Trent*, I leave to the Readers Judgment, having firſt duly weighed their own conſtant Principles and Tenets. *Du Moulin* (in his *Buckler of Faith*, p. 15.) hath theſe words. *It is falſe, that we affirm,*

The

The Church of God wants power to remit sins. The Faithful Pastors enjoy this power. The Scripture saith, The Pastors pardon sins, because God makes use of them to pardon sins. This is in effect the Pardons and *Indulgences* which the Pope grants, because God makes use of him to pardon sins, He proves this at large from several Texts of Scripture, *Mat.* 16.19. & 18,19. *Jo.*20.23. And in his 5*th* §. of the same Work he will have it, That all Pastors enjoy this Power equally, and adds, That when the sin is remitted, all temporal punishment is remitted at the same time; and by this Tenet they allow all their Pastors the Power of remitting both sin and the Punishment due before God to sin, which in effect makes them all Popes at large, and invests them confidently in that Papal Power, which by grave Authors is questioned in the Catholick Church. Why do these men quarrel with us about *Indulgences?* They remit the Penances enjoyn'd by their Discipline, and the Pope those by the Cannon Law: we teach, that in some cases (the sin being remitted) there remains yet due a temporal Punishment; But the Ministers confidently pardon both the one and the other, and that without the help of a Sacracrament, not esteeming Penance to be any, and without going farther than their *Justifying Faith*, they dis-

diſpatch the whole work. Is not this to believe, and admit of much more than we do? We teach, that Prieſts forgive ſins by the help of a Sacrament, where *Confeſſion* is requir'd, and a deep ſorrow for ſins committed, with a firm purpoſe of amendment, and yet after all this, oftentimes there remains a temporal puniſhment due, which is piouſly believ'd may be remitted by *Indulgences*.

Who is it now that attributes more to men according to their proper grounds and Tenets, either we or our Adverſaries? without doubt they. For every Miniſter, according to their Principles, for all ſins, and at all times, grants *plenary Indulgence*, yet they are angry with the Pope for doing far leſs, and more ſeldome. In a word, They give the largeſt Pardons that can be imagin'd, without reſervation of Caſes, without the help of a Sacrament, and at the ſame time free the Soul from all temporal Puniſhment, which is much more than we attribute to the greateſt of our *Indulgences*.

Of

CHAP. XIX.

Of the OBLIGATION due to CONSTITUTIONS and HUMANE LAWS, as well ECCLESIASTICAL as CIVIL.

WE have done with the *Rule of Faith* and the Application of it to the Principal points of Controversie. Let us now descend to the Question of Laws and Manners mentioned in this Chapter. The Council of *Trent* speaks thus: *If any one saith, That a justified man is not obliged to observe the Commandments of God, and the Church* Anathema. *If any one saith, That those who are baptized are freed from the Precepts of the holy Church, as well written as delivered by Tradition, and that they are not obliged to the performance of them,* Anathema. And again, *The holy Synod exhorts all Pastors carefully to recommend unto the Faithful a due obedience, principally in those things that belong to the mortification of the flesh, as the distinction of meats by abstinence, and fasts; or what concerns the encrease of Piety, as the devout and Religious observation of Festival days; advertising the people often to yeild obedience to their Superiours, and that those who hearken to them, hearken to God, the rewarder of all good; and who*

despise

despise them will find that God is their revenger. This is the Doctrine of the Council of *Trent*, and must be obey'd, as proceeding from a *General Council*, without any alteration, diminution, or augmentation. For the better understanding hereof, and to open a way of Agreement, or rather to show, That our Adversaries neither do nor can call this to question, if we adhere truly to the words of the Council, I thought good to premise these Four Animadversions.

The first is, That the Council speaks not of any yoke of Conscience nor Obligation under pain of mortal sin, nor yet of venial; she abstains from these Expressions which are frequent among Divines, though there wanted not eminent persons of that Profession in the Council.

The Second is, That she alledgeth no other Proofs to testifie our Obedience to our Superiours, and their Laws, but these Texts out of Scripture, *Heb.* 13. 17. *Obey your Prelates, and be subject to them.* Luke 10. 16. *He who hears you, hears me, who resists power, resists the Ordinance of God, and those that resist bring damnation upon themselves. Therefore be subject of necessity, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake,* Rom. 13. 2, 5.

The Third is, That the Ministers in their *Geneva* Bible, upon the last cited words, use

this Expreſſion, *Not only for the fear of Puniſhment, but alſo for that fear which is due to God by reaſon of his Ordinance*: And in their 40th Article thus, *We hold, That we ought to obey the Laws and Statutes of our Superiors, eſteeming them the Lieutenants and Officers of God.* Therefore, according to *Geneva*, we ought to obey the Laws and Statutes of our Superiors, not only for fear of Puniſhment, but alſo for the fear that is due to God in reſpect of his Ordinance: this being in effect as much as the Council exacts.

The Fourth is thus expreſs'd by *Vaſquez*, *l.2.diſp.*158.*n.*2. It is not certain, that either Secular, or Eccleſiaſtical Princes have received from God a particular warrant to oblige under mortal ſin, beſides the ordinary power they have to govern their Subjects: The Eccleſiaſtical, as they are deputed by God; and the ſecular, as from the Commonwealth, from whence proceeds naturally an Authority to oblige their Inferiours by their Laws according to the quality of the matter: and though neither Secular nor Eccleſiaſtical power can pretend to chaſtiſe their Delinquents with the pains of Hell, yet nature teacheth us, that diſobedience to our Parents, or Superiors in things lawful and honeſt, is a Crime, according to the quality of the matter; Diſobedience to Superiors being

in it self against right Reason, and nature. Of Transgressions some are mortal, some venial, in regard both being against Law and Reason, the one offends grievously, the other lightly; But that which highly opposeth Reason and Law, highly offends God, and consequently renders a man guilty of his displeasure, and what highly displeaseth God, dissolves his love to man, and of it self deserves eternal Punishment, not because God hath particularly constituted and appointed the Law, and threatned the Transgressors with such a Punishment, but because the fault of it self deserves that Punishment. For God would proceed unjustly (which cannot be imagin'd) if he should inflict Eternal Punishment upon a fault not deserving it; no less than another Judg in the same case; and with the same Punishment shall they be chastised, who, having no knowledg of any other Law, but that of nature, have committed this sin, according to the words of S. *Paul: Those that have sinned without the Law, shall perish without the Law:* By which he shews, that they shall be judged by the verdict of Reason against which they have sinned. Hence it follows, that the only Transgression of the Law of Nature renders a man guilty of Eternal pains, though in effect this seems to be done by the only will of God.

The ſame Author, [*diſp.* 154. *chap.* 2.] purſuing his Subject, ſaith, The Pope cannot oblige, under pain of mortal ſin, by vertue of receiving a power from him who can puniſh with eternal fire; it being not certain, that the Pope hath received any ſuch expreſs authority; but as he hath the right of Eccleſiaſtical power inveſted in him, he may juſtly command; and to diſobey him is both wicked and irrational, which argument hath alſo force in a ſecular Prince.

Vaſques goes on, ſaying, Upon this Univerſal Principle of the right of Nature (to wit, that we muſt obey our Superiours) is built the whole frame of humane Law; for it is not in the will of a humane Legiſlator to oblige, or not oblige, by his Law, but only to command or not command, to promulgate, or not promulgate: But the Law being made, and the commandment given, the Law of Nature obligeth us to obedience: and therefore the meaſure of our Obligation is to be taken from the Law it ſelf, and natural Reaſon after a due Promulgation of the poſitive Law, by our Superiour; Hitherto *Vaſques*. By which it is clear, That 'tis not the Superiour, nor the Law that obligeth the Conſcience under penalty of ſin, or impoſeth any yoke upon it, but God, and the Law

nature, which, supposing a positive Law enacted and promulgated, obligeth to the performance of it.

According to these Four Animadversions, and containing our selves purely within the Terms of the Council of *Trent*, I cannot discover any possible difference with our Separatists in this point; For, how can they swerve from what I have alleadged out of *Vasques*, *That no humane Law either Ecclesiastical or civil doth oblige under mortal sin, nor impose a yoke upon the Conscience* (which are the very terms of the Separatists in their 24th Article) *but onely in regard God, by his Holy Writ, and the Law of Nature, obligeth us to obey our Superiours, and Parents.* Thus much all men grant, and none can deny, that Superiours can make Laws; Therefore who disobey's his Superiours, and the Laws enacted by them, doth transgress the Law of God, which obliges us in conscience to obey our Superiours. This is sufficient for a submission to the Council of *Trent*, in this point, and consequently to be esteem'd a good *Catholick*.

Vasques affirms confidently, that no Law is of Force, if not received by the people, the Legislators conniving and consenting to their refusal; From whence many differences will cease, and many calumnies raised by,

by the Separatists, and particularly, by *du Moulin*, *Daille*, &c, who accuse the Church of forbidding the use of the Bible in the Vulgar tongue. And the Fathers of *Trent* (saith *du Moulin*) affirm, That the reading of Scriptures breeds more hurt than good to the people; though neither our Profession of Faith, nor the said Council mention any thing at all, by way of forbidding the use of the Bible, in the vulgar Tongue; wherefore this bold assertion will amount to a most impudent lie: All that the Council says, is in the Decree concerning the choice of Books, *Sess.* 18. *The holy Synod (perceiving, that the number of suspected and dangerous Books is too much encreased, in which many impure Doctrines are contained, and divulg'd) hath resolv'd, that some Fathers be deputed to enquire diligently, what is fit to be done in the censure of such Books, and report it in due time to the Council, that those extravagant Doctrines may be the more easily separated, as cockle from the wheat of Christian Truth: and something deliberated on, and resolved more conveniently to that purpose.* Here is no mention at all of the *Bible* in the Vulgar Tongue, nor of any danger in the reading it, though this is all that can be gather'd from the Vote of the Council of *Trent*.

Some are not a little surpriz'd, in that divers

divers Booksellers have bound up the *Index Expurgatorius* with the Decrees of that Council, and look upon it as a part of the Council, or at least proceeding from thence, though it never related to it, nor had any approbation from it, and much less did it ever forbid the use of the Bible in the vulgar Tongue, but onely speaks discreetly, and adviseth, that this matter be referr'd either to the Bishop, or to the Pastor, or to the Ghostly Father, by reason of weak and ill composed Spirits, which are apt to draw evil from good. These Laws which are meerly humane are often resembled to *Medals* which have two faces, and vary according to the times and circumstances. It is certain, that the reading of Scripture is both holy and useful, and yet accidently may occasion evil. In the sixth Rule of the *Index* is said, That the reading of the Books of Controversie, which are written in a vulgar Language, ought not generally to be permitted, no more than the Bible written in the same, but still with respect to the advice of S. *Peter*, (2 Eph. 3. 16.) that *there are hard passages in the Epistles of* S. *Paul*, (and the same may be affirmed of other Texts) *which the ignorant and unstable deprave to their own perdition*; and therefore in these we ought to proceed with the advice of our Di-

Directors. And this is as much as the *Index* endeavours to prevent, which yet is of no Obligation in *France*, nor any of the Bulls of *Rome* that maintain it.

From the same Rule of *Vasques*, common to all Divines, it follows also, That neither these Bulls, nor a great number of other *Canons*, *Constitutions* and *Decrees*, concerning manners, even of General Councils, and with greater reason of *Popes*, oblige not here among us, nor in many other Kingdoms.

Again it follows, in what sence these words of our *Profession* are to be understood. *I promise and swear true obedience to the Pope, or Bishop of* Rome, *and receive and profess undoubtedly all things ordain'd, defin'd, and declar'd by the holy Canons, and œcumenical Councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent.* To which I answer, whatsoever is defin'd to be of Faith by a General Council is held to be of Faith by all the Faithfull; and it is not necessary for this effect, and to render it of obligation, that it be accepted by the people, since truth it self is independent of all admission. But it is not so of Laws, which must be both promulgated and receiv'd before they are of force.

Much less obligation have we as Catholicks, to particular Devotions, and *Confraternities* of the *Rosary*, *Scapulary*, &c. now in practice

practice. For of these there is no mention at all in our profession of Faith, nor in the Council of *Trent*: and concerning the *Indulgences* belonging to the foresaid *Confraternities*, we ought to judg of them as in the precedent Chapter of *Indulgences*, and no otherways; Wherefore our Separatists ought not to retard their submission to the Church upon the Calumnies and jeers rais'd by some Ministers in derision of these particular Devotions, which (though not at all reprehensible in themselves, if rightly understood) may be omitted without either prejudice to Faith, or the Unity of the Church.

CHAP. XX.

Concerning some ERRORS *proceeding from* IGNORANCE, *which ought to be laid aside.*

S T. *Austin* [*lib.* 20. *chap.* 21.] (writing against *Faustus* the Manichean) having set down the Doctrine of the Catholick Church, goes on thus, *Christian people celebrate the memory of Martyrs with a Religious solemnity, that thereby they may be excited to their imitation, associated to their merits, and assisted by their Prayers*: Yet we do not offer

Sacrifice to the Martyrs, but to the God of Martyrs; though it is confess'd, we erect Altars, in the Memories, that is, Churches of Martyrs: and if any man should fall into this or any other Error, he is soon reprehended by the wholsome Doctrine of the Church, either to be corrected, condemned or avoided.

Of this nature are divers Errors derived from the practice of weak and ignorant persons, as also others falsly objected by our Adversaries, and disavowed by the Church, particularly concerning *Indulgences*, and the *Lives of Saints*, which were clear'd by the grounds of our *Rule of Faith*, in their proper places.

Du Moulin scoffingly writes, That the Book of *Roman Indulgences* says, that at S. *Eusebius* in *Rome*, there are every day to be gain'd 78 thousand years of pardon, and as many *Quarantena's* or 40 days, and at St. *Laurence* both a Plenary Indulgence, and besides for 11000 years, and 48 *Quarantena's* &c. But *the true Histories of* Roman *Indulgences*, *says* Bellarmin, *are not to be taken from Enemies, no, nor from I know not what petty Books, such as* Kemnitius *says, he has seen one Printed at* Norimberg, *compos'd in the* German Tongue, *with great amplifications of such Indulgences; but from the Papal Bulls themselves,*

selves, and the Records of the Churches: For no doubt but in such little, incertain and nameless Pamphlets we may meet with many fictions and corrupted Stories, of which Bellarmin *gives some Instances, and then says, Never did I read in any approved Authors, that Indulgences for thousands of dayes or years were ever granted; (much less for hundreds of thousands, and Quarantena's besides:) nor do there want Authors, who deny that the Popes ever gave such Indulgences remissive of penance for many thousand years; but say they were the inventions of the Quæstors;* so John Gerson, *and* Dominicus Sotus: *For the Popes used only to grant Indulgences for so many years as the Penance enjoined should otherwise have lasted; which ordinarily was* 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 10, *or* 20 *years, or at most, for ones life.*

As for the *Legends*, which the Ministers both in their Books and Sermons cry out so clamourously against, and so boldly charge as own'd by the Church of *Rome*, 'tis a meer calumny to impose them on her; but I hope, I have already sufficiently cleared, this point, not admitting many of the Stories of *Jacobus de Voragine*, and *Simeon Metaphrastes*, to be so much as true, or even probable; so far are we from holding them as parts of our Faith: How many of these are rejected by *Baronius*, and after him by *Ri-*

badineire? Does not *Bellarmin* too cenſure ſuch Writers, as perſons who added of their own heads and Inventions, what might have been true, not what was? However our ſhort anſwer is, There's none of all this in our *Profeſſion*, not in the Council of *Trent*.

But above all they will needs perſwade us, that the common people adore Saints and Pictures, as they do God, and in their Objections fancy to themſelves ſuch groſs Errors as are beneath the loweſt capacities. *Daille* will have it, that the people ſpend all their Devotions upon Pictures, nay that they make no difference betwixt the Picture and the Prototype, nay, which is yet more ſottiſh, not even betwixt the Picture of one Object and of another. *Du Moulin* is ſo impudent as to deliver upon his credit, that *the Catholicks in their Litany, ſay, St. Peter pray for us; but when they come to our Lady, they ſay not, holy* Mary *pray for us, no more than to our Saviour* Jeſus Chriſt. The ſame Author affirms, confidently, *That the Popes have placed their Decrees and Canons, not only in the ſame rank with the holy Scripture, but above it*: And Again, *That in the Canon of the Maſs our B. Lady is preferr'd before our Saviour, and placed in a ſuperiour form*; with a thouſand other Calumnies and Lies, broach'd moſt out of malice, and many out of Ignorance

norance; to which I onely return this general answer; Nothing of all this is found in our *Profession of Faith*, nor *General Councils*, which is sufficient for a rational man not to be diverted out of his course of seeking repose and Salvation in the *Catholick Church*.

CHAP. XXI.

The BENEFIT of thus severing FAITH from OPINIONS

I Have represented in general, and in particular, the importance of this exact separation, and shew'd, that it is not only rational but necessary: I have also noted the utilities that accrue from thence, which appear more evidently, and will be more easily comprehended by the application made to the several Subjects.

I. I can justly say, That this Separation is a brief and solid Answer to nine parts of ten, of all that is objected by the Ministers, in their Books and Sermons; for when we lay aside School-questions, problematical opinions, popular Errors, and apparent Calumnies, we take away their Arms, oblige them to silence, or to fight with Windmills of thir own making, or else to make use of their

their Sophiſtry and Fallacies, expounded very well by *Du Moulin* in his *Elements of Logick*, called *Ignoratio Elenchi*; which is for example, when one arguing againſt me, produceth a *Concluſion*, which he offers as a contradiction to what I maintain; and yet in effect it doth not prejudice me at all, but may ſafely be granted: This is termed *Ignoratio Elenchi*; and this is for the moſt part our caſe, ſince their Objections above mentioned (not at all contradicting our Articles of Faith) compoſe at leaſt nine parts in ten of their whole Volumes: whilſt they never produce either Scripture, General Councils, or Fathers, clearly teaching their Doctrine; For Example, That in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt there is no true and real preſence of the body of *Jeſus Chriſt*, and, that there is no converſion of the ſubſtance of the bread into his body, which we call *Tranſubſtantiation*; nor what is contained in their 36th Article; *He nouriſheth us with the ſubſtance of his body, by Faith.* Turn over all their Books, and you ſhall never find theſe Propoſitions, either in expreſs Terms, or deducible by neceſſary Conſequences: And therefore you ought not to take notice of their Extravagancies, but oblige your ſelf to this ſtrict Separation, by which you put them either to ſilence, or to fight with their

own

own shadows. And since they pretend to reform us by Scripture, it is both fit and necessary they should produce some pregnant and pertinent Texts, to confirm their own, and discover the Errors of our Tenets.

II. By this means also is compass'd an easie way to invite our Separatists to a Reunion with the Church, to detest their Schism, and to abjure their Errors, contrary to our Profession of Faith; since the main mistake consists in that they are perswaded the Church holds for Articles of Faith what she never proposeth to be believed, but leaves all men to their freedome in School-questions, and problematical Opinions.

III. This Separation also diminisheth so much the number of points in debate, that I dare confidently affirm, there will not remain a third part to be argued, whereas the accustomed mixture causeth an encrease without end, and if you should deduct out of *Bellarmin*, and other Writers of Controversie, what really belongs not to Faith, you would much abbreviate their large Volumns; perhaps of Forty debated Questions, thirty five would be unnecessary: And why is not the shortest way with all possible Charity to be endeavour'd, since the end is so important, and so much to be desired?

IV. This confused mixture puts us often

to

as the plunge, to find out convincing Proofs against our Adversaries, and leaves sometimes under some difficulty even a true Article of Faith; For since the debates consist for the most part, of points, which indeed are not of Faith, how is it possible to bring Arguments convincive, that they are of Faith?

V. Few of us by reason of such mixture are able to manage such Disputes, and assuredly prove even our Faith it self; for few are well vers'd in the whole latitude and numerous variety of School-Opinions, for which some of our own Doctors, though very learned, decline sometimes to enter into such Conferences. Few also of our Separatists, for the same cause are capable of Instruction, until they receive a true Information of what is, and what is not of Faith themselves being generally little acquainted with Scholastick subtleties.

FINIS.